CHRIST'S KINGDOM AND CHURCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

REV. H. B. KENDALL B. A.

9 x 14. 2/6

£1-00

CHRIST'S KINGDOM AND CHURCH

THE HARTLEY LECTURE FOR 1901

CHRIST'S KINGDOM AND CHURCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Delivered before the Primitive Methodist Conference
Sheffield, June 11th, 1901

BY THE

Rev. H. B. KENDALL, B.A.

LONDON
ROBERT BRYANT
PRIMITIVE METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE
48-50 ALDERSGATE STREET, E.C.

PRINTED BY
COWAN & CO., LTD.
PERTH

CONTENTS

Christ's Kingdom and Church in the Nineteenth Century

CHAPTER I

THE KINGDOM; THE CHURCH; THE WORLD

I.—Scripture Data.

"Kingdom of God"; "Kingdom of Heaven"; "Church;" "World." Leaving over for a time the consideration of the last named, what, we may ask, are the data furnished by the New Testament for enabling us to discriminate between these terms? What is the meaning, and what the precise relation to each other, of the things or ideas signified by the terms in question? Let the familiar facts be rapidly summarised once more. Christ's favourite expression is "Kingdom." In the Gospels it occurs some hundred and twelve times, and for the most part as Christ's own word. Sometimes He speaks simply of "My Kingdom," but more frequently we have the fuller expression, "Kingdom of God" or "Kingdom of Heaven." The latter form is peculiar to Matthew,

but is found there as often as thirty-three times. Harnack points out that in Christ's teaching concerning the Kingdom, two contrasted strands of thought are plainly observable: one, in which the traditional idea of the Kingdom as something external and awaiting future dramatic development is taken up; the other in which the inwardness and immediacy of the Kingdom are insisted upon. Harnack regards the saying that the Kingdom "cometh not with observation" as one of the most original and significant *logia* of Christ. He looks upon the sayings of which this is a sample as being the very kernel of Christ's teaching, while he does not hesitate to regard the traditional ideas of the Kingdom, which Christ shared, and in a measure retained, as only serving the useful but temporary purpose of the husk.[1]

When we turn to the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, we find a marked change. The Kingdom, according to Christ's dominant idea of it, is, indeed, not altogether wanting; for it is Paul who says: "The Kingdom . . . is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. xiv 17); yet there is a tendency to identify the Kingdom more and more closely with the future and the external. On the other hand, "Church" has now become the great word; and be it remembered, this word "Church" Christ used but twice, even if we admit the genuineness of one of the passages in which it occurs, which rests under some suspicion.

It does not need much reflection to discover that the questions raised by the facts just adduced are

[1] Harnack, "What is Christianity?" pp. 52-55.

interesting in themselves, must have far-reaching issues, and will not be easy to answer. Naturally, therefore, these questions concerning the nature of the Kingdom and its relation to the Church have, especially of late years, been largely discussed ; but the conclusions arrived at have been so curiously divergent as to set in a clear light the difficulty of the problem involved, and to suggest the thought that very likely we have not all the data requisite for reaching a conclusion that shall win general acceptance.

A new " History of the Variations of Protestants " might easily be written, which should summarise and comment on the divergent views of theologians with regard to the Kingdom and the Church. Let the following be taken as a small sample. Dr. Denny is " not confident that in principle there is any distinction between them," [1] while Professor Orr says that " both in idea and in fact, the Kingdom of God stretches far beyond the Church." [2] To Ritschl and his school, the community of believers on its ethical side is the Kingdom ; while the same community, as worshipping, is the Church. But this view is rightly objected to by many on the ground that the Kingdom of God cannot properly be described as a " community " ; further, that it tends to divide what should never be put asunder even in thought, much less in practice, viz., ethics and worship ; and lastly, because it is inconsistent with Paul's lofty and intensely spiritual conception of the Church. With the Ritschlian school, again, the Kingdom of God is made the determina-

[1] Denny, " Studies in Theology," p. 184.
[2] Professor Orr, " The Ritschlian Theology," p. 259.

tive principle of theology ; others demur to this and hold that its place is rather within the system. Some writers,[1] while agreeing that the Kingdom of God corresponds to what, since the days of Luther and Calvin, if not before, has been called the "*Invisible* Church," make the Kingdom of Heaven stand for the visible Church, into which men may enter, or from which they may be excluded. But this somewhat paradoxical view is virtually discountenanced by the late Professor Bruce, who says: "The expression [the Kingdom of Heaven] suggests the thought that the Kingdom is an ideal hovering over all actual societies, civil or sacred, like Plato's Republic, to be found realised in perfection nowhere upon this earth, the true home of which is the supersensible world." [2]

II.—Some Recent Definitions of the Kingdom.

Let this amount of reference to discrepant views suffice. For ourselves, of the two terms now under consideration, we regard the Kingdom of God as the larger and more comprehensive expression. Thus much might be gathered from the mere title of this Lecture. What we conceive to be other particular differences between the two will come into view as we proceed. Meantime, it might not be amiss to

[1] R. M'Cheyne Edgar, in "The Genius of Protestantism," p. 117. Edgar quotes the Rev. W. Simpson's "The Forgiveness of Sins by God and Man," for same view.

[2] Professor Bruce, "The Kingdom of God," p. 58.

give one or two of the latest definitions of the Kingdom of God we have met with—definitions that have much to commend them, and that will, at least, serve to indicate what is the modern trend of thought on this subject.

First, we give Professor Findlay's conception of the Kingdom. He says: "It includes things as well as persons; it covers the entire range of human affairs, so far as they are directed by the laws of God, and come under the sovereignty of the Lord Christ. Business, politics, art and science, natural and domestic life, all belong to the Kingdom of God in its widest sense. In its essence and governing forces, that Kingdom is spiritual; but in its effects and operations, the Kingdom of God extends to every department and item of man's life. It works as a leaven in the entire lump of humanity." [1]

After a review of Christ's teaching concerning the Kingdom, the Rev. T. Herbert Stead embodies his findings in the following definition: "The Kingdom of God is the fellowship of souls divine and human, of which the law and the life are love, wherein the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, as both are embodied in Jesus the Christ, are recognised and realised." [2]

Once more, Harnack, in his latest work, "What is Christianity?" uses words which give striking expression to the tendency observable in so much of the best Christian thought of our time—the tendency which leads men to brush aside all irrelevancies,

[1] Professor Findlay, "The Church of Christ as set forth in the New Testament," pp. 13, 14.

[2] T. H. Stead, M.A., "The Kingdom of God."

whether priestly middleman or sacramental, or other intermediary apparatus, and to come direct to God in Christ, to find in the fact of personal experience the assurance craved for by both mind and heart, as well as the true secret of life and power. Whether we may not find more meaning in Harnack's words than he himself intended to convey may be a question. However that may be, here are his words: "If anyone wants to know what the Kingdon of God and the coming of it meant in Jesus' message, he must read and study his parables. He will then see what it is that is meant. The Kingdom of God comes by coming to the individual, by entering into his soul and laying hold of it. True, the Kingdom of God is the rule of God; but it is the rule of the holy God in the hearts of individuals; *it is God Himself in His power.*[1] Take whatever parable you will—the parable of the sower, of the pearl of great price, of the treasure buried in the field—the Word of God, God Himself, is the Kingdom. It is not a question of angels and devils, thrones and principalities, but of God and the soul, the soul and its God" (p. 56). . . . "It is in the nature of spiritual force, a power which sinks into a man within, and can be understood only from within. Thus, although the Kingdom is also in heaven, although it will come with the day of judgment, he can still say of it: 'It is not here or there; it is within you.'"

Now let Washington Gladden give us his thought concerning the Kingdom: "In the largest sense of the word we may say that the Kingdom of God is the whole social organism, so far as it is affected by

[1] The italics are Harnack's own.

divine influences. Human society is an organism; it is a whole, whose parts are intrinsically and vitally related to it; humanity is one body, with many members. Every organism is the product of one co-ordinating life force; and the vital principle of this social organism is the life which is in Christ, and which is the light of men."[1]

Lastly, a sentence of Principal Forsyth's may fittingly end this short catena of quotations, for any definition of the Kingdom which takes the thought or influence of Christ, but makes no direct reference to the person of Christ, must surely be defective. Dr. Forsyth's pregnant sentence is not chargeable with this defect: "For the Kingdom of God—what is it but the Son of God in multitude, as the Son is the Kingdom in a soul."[2]

I.—The World that can be Leavened.

We know, alas! that the old-standing antinomy between the Kingdom and the World has not been overcome. The one lies over against the other, and "they are contrary the one to the other." When Augustine, in his noble book, set himself to trace the progress of the City of God, he had also to follow the development of that other mystical city

[1] "The Church and the Kingdom," p. 6.

[2] "The Charter of the Church," p. 74.

"In the person of Jesus, even had there been no other, the Kingdom of God was already present in humanity. In Him lay the vital germ of that Kingdom. He was the bearer and representative of its principle of Sonship; in Him its powers and grace were made manifest."—Orr, article "Kingdom of God," in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible."

which, because of its origin, he calls the City of Man. He found its beginnings shadowed forth in the passage which records how Cain built for himself a city: "But Abel was a pilgrim, and built none. For the City of the Saints is above, though it have citizens here upon earth, wherein it liveth as a pilgrim until the time of the Kingdom come."[1] And so Cain's city still abides. It is the anti-Kingdom—the World of which St. James speaks when he says: "Whosoever, therefore, would be a friend of the world, maketh himself an enemy of God" (James iv. 4); and in regard to which John exhorts: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him" (1 John ii. 15).

If it be a task beset with difficulty to draw the frontier lines of the Church and the Kingdom, it is a task still more difficult and delicate to follow the dividing lines between the Kingdom and the World. And yet how lightly we can assay the task! We lift our eyes, and point the finger and say, "The World is there" and "There is the Kingdom." We do it with the same confidence and precision with which the members of a delimiting commission might survey and mark off the frontiers of their respective territories. And we fear theologians are not the least sinners in this respect; their very loyalty to what they deem the truth, and their fondness for definite outlines, tend to make them too absolute in their judgment. They have little idea of relativity, and fail to realise the wide sweep of its working; so they are prone to blunder in their

[1] Augustine, "Of the Citie of God," 1610. Lib. xv., cap. i.

surveying by drawing the lines which separate the marches of the Kingdom and the anti-Kingdom too arbitrarily. Indeed, account for it how we may, we are all in some danger of tamely surrendering to the World slices of territory to which it has no shadow of right; just as St. Augustine never got quite rid of the taint of Manicheism; so perhaps the subtle infection of this heresy still clings to us, and accounts for our repeating after another fashion the practice which obtained in many parishes of Scotland up to the seventeenth century. There was suffered to exist a certain portion of land called the Gudeman's Croft. It was never ploughed or cultivated, but simply let alone and allowed to lie waste; and it was understood to be the portion of the enemy of mankind.

Now, what is noteworthy and commendable about some of the definitions of the Kingdom which we have borrowed is that they recognise the magnitude of Christ's claim, how far back it goes in time, the length and breadth of it in space. They regard the world of nature, and what Washington Gladden calls the "social organism," from its beginning onward, as Christ's legitimate "sphere of influence." We know something of spheres of influence in these days, and we know enough to be aware that spheres of influence tend to become, sooner rather than later, spheres of occupancy. The world did not begin when Christ came, neither did the Kingdom of God; both the word and the thing itself were already there. But though Christ found and did not bring the conception of the Kingdom, He gave it a higher meaning scarcely dreamed of before—the conception of the

new humanity in Christ. It was, therefore, emphatically a new beginning Christ made—a beginning on a higher plane which man, unassisted, could never have reached. So Christ founded the Kingdom of the highest and the best, and of that Kingdom He is the head and the vital principle. But the best implies the lower good, and also the better which lies between the two. And so there stretched behind Christ the vista of time, clear to Him, though dark to us, in which the world was preparing, and the generations began to move forward in long procession to the goal of the race which also Christ clearly sees. He is Lord of the past, and of those who lived in the past. In these days the idea of the organic oneness of the race is a powerful sentiment; and so we cannot help often casting a glance into the "dark backward and abysm of time," to think of the poor, struggling generations that have helped to make us what we are, and to give us what we enjoy. If we could not think of them as having had some part, however small, in the Kingdom of the good, the thought of these, our poor kinsmen after the flesh, would make us inexpressibly sad. But the All-Father is just and pitiful, and did not leave Himself without witness in those dim, far-past days.

Such thoughts as these may be specially congenial to our time, but they are not without due warranty in the Scripture. Thus, in the Book of Proverbs, Wisdom hypostatised speaks of herself as being possessed by the Lord in the beginning of His way, and as

> "Rejoicing in His habitable earth,
> And my delight was with the children of men."

Similarly, in Ecclesiasticus (xxiv.), Wisdom is represented as saying:

> "In the waves of the sea, and in all the earth,
> And in every nation I got a possession."

But though Wisdom, to use Margoliouth's words, "reserved to herself a *pied-à-terre* in every race," her chosen and established seat was Mount Sion, in the beloved and holy city.

In the Book of Revelation, that "Divine Parable of History," as it has been well called, we have a presentation, in highly symbolic form, of the same truth that creation's attitude to God is one of glad subordination and obedience. According to Canon Gore, who has recently delivered a remarkable series of sermons on the Apocalypse, the four living creatures full of eyes before and behind, that John saw before the throne, represent the forces of Nature. They are before the throne, dependent, ministering, adoring. "And they have no rest, day and night, saying: Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God, the Almighty, which was and which is and which is to come."

But there is another act in this majestic scene. We behold a mystical book, close sealed with seven seals, which none is able to open. That sealed book represents the enigma of the world which often baffles and half maddens men: "Famine, pest, volcano, storm and fire," deformity, sadness, disease, death; "the heavy and the weary weight of all this unintelligible world." Can none open the book and read the enigma? The seer of Patmos wept much because no one was found equal to the mighty task. But, praise to the Lamb that

was slain! He came and took the book, and prevailed to break the seals. All this may be a parable, but it is a parable the meaning of which is clear. The "Enigmas of Life," upon which W. R. Gregg wrote so sadly, and which press so heavily on the minds of thoughtful men, are enigmas to which the Christ, who went the way of the Cross, holds the key.

The thoughts we have been striving to express concerning Christ's relation to the world of nature and man, the Apostle Paul contrived to pack into one sentence, nay, into a single word: "And He is before all things, and in Him all things *consist*" (marg., hold together). He uses an encyclopædic word—a word of infinite meaning. Bushnell—who, we fear, is not much read now—had evidently meditated deeply on this word "consist" in the connection in which it stands, and had caught much of its deep suggestiveness, or he could not have written of it as he has done in these words: "Christianity, in other words, is not an afterthought of God, but a forethought. It even antedates the world of nature, and is 'before all things'—'before the foundation of the world.' Instead of coming into the world, as being no part of the system, or to interrupt and violate the system of things, they all *consist*, come together into system in Christ, as the centre of unity and the head of the universal plan. The world was made to include Christianity; under that becomes a proper and complete frame of order; to that crystallises, in all its appointments, events, and experiences; in that has the design or final cause revealed, by which all its distributions, laws, and historic changes are determined and systematised.

All which is beautifully and even sublimely expressed in the single word *con-sist*, a word that literally signifies *standing together;* as when many parts coalesce in a common whole."[1]

II.—The "World," or anti-Kingdom.

But when all abatements have been made, and all has been said that can be said, there still remains the antithesis, the antinomy, the irreconcilable antagonism between the Kingdom of God and the anti-Kingdom which the New Testament calls the "World." This world, whatever it be, cannot be a Divine creation, else we should at once be committed to Dualism and Manicheism. Hence Augustine had got hold of the right thought when he gave the name "City of Man" to that which was the direct opposite of the City of God. For the world, like the Kingdom of God, being in its essence spiritual and personal, has its source and seat in the mind of man as perverted and working abnormally. We hear a great deal in these days about "degeneration" and "decadents." In the Word of God sin is "folly" and "vanity"; and from the standpoint of the Kingdom the sinner must be classed as a decadent. The point to notice, however, is the human origin of the World. As St. John teaches: All "that is in it came out from it, from nothing *higher*, but from the world is it" (ii. 16). John proceeds to give us something like a definition of this World which is not from the Father: It is "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the vain-

[1] "Nature and the Supernatural," p. 14.

glory of life." [1] It may be more than a mere fancy that would see in this enumeration of the perversions of the human will that constitute the World, a threefold category under which the sins of men may be comprehended. In any case, it is remarkable that the first parents of mankind are represented as succumbing to the temptations to sensuous gratification, ambition, pride or presumption, which were the very temptations which the second Adam conquered.

For the World, as thus conceived, reality cannot be claimed in the same sense that reality can be claimed for the Kingdom of God. The truth and righteousness and love which the good man appropriates and makes his own, have to do with what is permanent and independent and self-identical. These qualities and energies of the quickened soul are the "things of the Kingdom" of which Christ talked to the disciples before He ascended to His Father. The Kingdom of the Good and the Best is also the Kingdom of the Real. But the World lacks this abidingness and universality and independence. "The world passeth away and the lust thereof." "Evil is real in the same sense that our pleasures and pains are real, but not in the same sense that the ideal is real." [2] To say that there is nothing so individual as a man's sin is only to put the same truth in another way. A man's sin is his very own. He can claim paternity in regard to

[1] See the Bishop of Derry's illuminative comment on St. John's teaching concerning the "World" in "The Epistles of St. John" (Expositors' Bible Series). It may also be noted that Prof. Milligan, in his "The Book of Revelation" (Expositors' Bible Series), regards the first beast of Rev. xiii. as the impersonation of the World against which St. John, in common with St. Paul, St. James, and Christ Himself warns us.

[2] T. B. Jevon's "Evolution," p. 226.

it. With David, he can say, "My sin is ever before me." It is as though every time he committed a sin there flitted from him a spectral shape typifying the very nature of the sin he has committed, whether it be the sin of greed or lust or hate. That is *his* sin; he may drive it from him and seek to forget it, but it, and those like unto it, are the progeny of his own perverted will, and like the unclean spirit of the parable, they may say: "We will return to the house whence we came out." The time they choose for their return is often when the shadows of death are gathering and closing in. Then the spectral shapes of sin throng the dying sinner's couch and claim their right of kinship. We come across an illustration of this thought in an unexpected quarter. In his powerful but repulsive drama, called "Ghosts," Ibsen makes Mrs. Alving utter certain words which really furnish the *motif* of the drama as well as its title. "I almost think," Mrs. Alving says, "that we are all of us ghosts, Pastor Manders. It is not only what we have inherited from our father and mother that 'walks' in us. It is all sorts of dead ideas and lifeless old beliefs, and so forth. They have no vitality, but they cling to us all the same, and we can't get rid of them. Whenever I take up a newspaper I seem to see ghosts gliding between the lines. There must be ghosts all the country over, as thick as the sand of the sea." When we know the kind of life the characters of Ibsen's drama lead, the reflection put into the mouth of Mrs. Alving seems perfectly just. They belong to the "World" of St. John; that is, not from God, every inhabitant of which "walketh in a vain show." Edmund Burke once exclaimed:

"What shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue!" "No," was the comment of Thomas Binney, "all is not vanity. We were made to seek the Lord, if haply we might feel after Him and find Him." To find the bed-rock of God in Christ, and to build thereon, redeems life from the charge of vanity, and assures the soul of the possession of that "life which is life indeed," and of its community with the good of all ages and of all climes. Such a life is but a personal and individual manifestation and sharing of that life of righteousness, truth, and love which, because it has God for its source, is universal and eternal.

The World, such as we conceive it to be, might be spoken of as the anti-Kingdom, were it not that such a term assumes it to have a unity and solidarity foreign to its very nature. When we read of the nefarious doings of the Tammany Ring, and see how in our own land the "trade" is extending and perfecting its demoralising machinery, we sometimes think and speak as if evil were able to organise itself for its own selfish purposes more highly and successfully than do the children of the Kingdom when they seek their own or others' good. The strange composite figures—half animal, half human—that were fitly chosen to represent the mighty monarchies of the East, may remain to impress us with their massiveness and strength; but they remain only as suggestive pieces of antiquity, for the despotisms they so aptly symbolised have passed, as every organisation that is based on force or fraud or greed, however mighty it seems, must ultimately pass. Evil, we must remember, despite all appearances to

the contrary, is still the anarchic egoistic principle, and in the long run must work its own destruction. Hence, though for convenience' sake we may call the "World" of Christ and the apostles the anti-Kingdom, it is with the conviction that it is but a mock shadow-kingdom after all. Call that a kingdom where ten thousand times ten thousand clashing wills are in conflict! Call it anarchy, rather. That only is the real kingdom whence goes up the constant prayer—"Thy Kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is done in heaven."

We have little doubt that under the threefold category of John, before referred to, might be brought all the chief evils which marked the nineteenth century. But if any attempt at such classification be made at all, it must be made later on when we have to consider the Kingdom of God as militant, warring against its opposite; as the sword seeking to destroy what it cannot turn to account; as the exorcist casting out the evil spirits tormenting society. Meanwhile, we see enough evidence of the presence of that sin which robs man of his peace and strength, and of the evils which prey upon society, to save us from cheap optimism. In fact, neither pessimism nor optimism, in the proper sense of those terms, is just the creed for the Christian. Pessimism, if etymology counts for anything, should mean: Things are very bad, and are getting worse; and optimism should mean: Things are so good that they could not possibly be better. The one view is just as false as the other; the truth lies between the two, and it is only a robust and intelligent faith that can effect the needed reconciliation. The Christian's sentiment, as he looks out

upon the complex movements going on around, will rather shape itself after this fashion: Things are bad enough, but they might be a great deal worse, and they are going to be a great deal better, and I am going to help God make them better. We confess to getting a little tired of the everlasting quotation of the couplet from Browning's "Pippa Passes":

> "God's in His heaven,
> All's right with the world."

Surely it is the most hackneyed quotation in current Christian literature! Unfortunately, it is as false as it is hackneyed if the writer meant anything more than the guard means when he says "All's right," and then gives the signal for starting. The world, thanks to God's guiding hand, is moving in the right direction; but we are a long way from the terminus yet. It may even be we are nearer the beginning than the end of our long journey. If this be all that Browning meant, then it is as right with his couplet as it is with the world. But we suspect many enthusiastic quoters of these lines read a great deal more into them than this. May we submit an alternative couplet that would possibly serve their turn? Though the lines are destitute of poetic merit, they may have the modest merit of affording a variation, and also of being true:

> "Christ's in His heaven,
> There's hope for the world."

CHAPTER II

THE DOUBLE MOVEMENT OF THE CENTURY

IF, following the example of Cave, the Church historian, we were to attempt to sum up the chief characteristic of the nineteenth century in a single word, what ought that word to be? The tenth century was the *sæculum obscurum*, and the eighteenth has been called by Mark Pattison the *sæculum rationalisticum*,[1] and by Carlyle the "bankrupt century." What label shall we affix to the nineteenth? Dr. Wallace, indeed, as we all know, has dubbed it the "wonderful century," and in certain respects the description is not inappropriate. When we remember that it was the age of scientific discovery and of industrial progress, the century does indeed seem to deserve the title "wonderful." But from our standpoint of the Church and the Kingdom, such a description is not definite enough, and might be considered a trifle too flattering. Yet the century which witnessed the marvellous expansion of Methodism, the formation of the National Federation of the Evangelical Free Churches, the preparation of the Free Church Catechism—which Mr. Hugh Price Hughes maintains was the greatest thing in its way that has been done since the meeting of the West-

[1] "Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1680-1750," in "Essays and Reviews," 1861.

minster Assembly of Divines—the lusty growth of Christian Endeavourism, and which closed with all arrangements made for the great Simultaneous Mission, would seem to have a fair title to be called "The Wonderful Century." Nor must we forget, what we were reminded of in the Hartley Lecture of last year, that the nineteenth century was pre-eminently the Missionary Century. Now, can a generalisation be found, sufficiently wide without being too vague, that will take in, and in a measure account for, these several remarkable features of the religious life of the nineteenth century that have been enumerated, and other features that might be recalled? We think it not impossible; for to our minds the most remarkable thing about the past century, as we look at it from our present standpoint, is the way in which the idea of the Kingdom of God has taken hold of the minds of men, and the manifold ways in which that idea has striven to give itself outward expression and embodiment.

But the matter is not quite so simple as this. Besides the growth of the idea of the Kingdom which is so striking a feature of the century, there has also been an equally striking growth of the idea of the Church; that is, as a close and visible community, possessing exclusive authority and privilege. The two movements have gone on together, keeping equal step, as it were; so that what we see is a double polar movement in process. Probably the two movements may have not gone on quite independently of each other; there may have been action and reaction. The Catholicism of the monopolist churches may have been stimulated to greater activity, and provoked to

stiffen its claims by the very fact that the Catholicity of Christ was everywhere seen to be acting both as a solvent and leavening influence in society, loosening the bonds of old custom and prejudice, levelling middle walls of partition, and working as a healing and integrating force. On the other hand, while it is undoubtedly true that narrowness creates a corresponding narrowness, it is also often true that narrowness on one side begets an opposite breadth on the other, so that we have ultra-Catholics calling forth ultra-Protestants of the true Orange colour, and the Church Union confronted and counterworked by the Church Association, and Lord Halifax serving as the *raison d'être* of John Kensit. We may also often observe how men, by a natural revulsion from Church exclusiveness, come to see, and more fully appreciate, the freedom and breadth of the Kingdom of God. Be this as it may, the phenomenon of the century we deem so worthy of notice is just this double polar movement it has exhibited, and which is still going on. It is indeed phenomenal in the sense that it is truly remarkable and without precedent.

We shall have to consider separately, and somewhat in detail, the progress and the phases of this double movement, beginning first with the Kingdom of God; but before doing so, it may be well carefully to note how dissimilar and even oppugnant are these two movements ; how widely they stand opposed in principle, origin, and end. What do we understand by the Church-idea? Perhaps we may have been accustomed to divide churches into those which are governed by the principle of authority, and those which are constituted on the basis of reason in the

form of private judgment. But this division is faulty, and will not stand the test of examination; for, as Professor Iverach has conclusively shown,[1] the seeming antithesis thus set up between authority and reason is an unreal one; it is only an abstraction, that is all. As the result of a mental process, two things are set in opposition which a wider unity might be found to embrace. There is reason in authority, and there is authority in reason.

By the Church-idea we mean the doctrine of salvation by the Church, and by one particular Church; so that the proper term for such an institution—if such there be—would seem to be, the Monopolist Church. It will trade with you, but it will only trade with you on its own terms; so that if you refuse to accept the conditions and pay the price demanded, you must take the consequences and starve. What the particular conditions imposed may be need not just now be considered, since that question is immaterial to the point in hand. It would not matter how hard the conditions were, how high the price asked, if you were only free to go elsewhere and buy on better terms. What makes the matter so serious is that you are shut up to the Monopolist Church. It is really impossible, in the nature of things, that there can, strictly speaking, be more Monopolist Churches than one. Further, if it be asserted that such a Church exists, whether at Rome, or Canterbury, or Moscow, it can only be such in the strength of the undoubted fact that Christ has granted such a monopoly, and arranged that all grace

[1] "Theism in the Light of Present Science and Philosophy," p. 193.

shall be dispensed through the medium of this highly privileged corporation. Yes, Monopolist Church is the rather ugly word for any Church that claims such exclusive prerogatives as these.

Let it not be thought that we are saying hard things and sinning against charity. We are merely trying, by the help of a homely figure borrowed from the market, to get a nearer view of an idea which has wrought itself into history, and which must be held responsible for the butchery of St. Bartholomew and all the horrors of the Inquisition. Consult Lecky and he will tell you what this idea, incorporated in a system and logically reduced to practice, has done in the way of persecution. He will go on with his recital until you cry "Hold! enough!"[1] And this idea is not dead, but is coming forth and seeking to gain a footing, and win recognition for itself in this land of light and liberty and justice. It is well, therefore, we should put the idea to the question, and inquire into its origin and antecedents. These antecedents are shady enough; for with this idea Christ was brought into conflict, and it attended Him to the Judgment Seat and the Cross.

In "Pro Christo et Ecclesia," which, to our thinking, is one of the most remarkable books that appeared in the closing years of the century, the anonymous author shows us the *dramatis personæ* and the progress of the divine drama, in which "the contest between the Kingdom of God and the kingdom of this world was fought within the Church." Under

[1] "The Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe." See especially the chapter, "The History of Persecution," vol. ii., pp. 1-97.

his guidance we see how the Jewish Church, into which Christ was born, was so vitiated by one irreligious principle as to incur the heaviest denunciations of the Master. What mean these oft-repeated woes pronounced upon the Scribes and Pharisees? Why these scathing rebukes? How account for Christ's very different bearing and language to the publicans and sinners—persons of no account or of ill account? We have our answer pat and ready: It was because they were hypocrites. But the answer is too easy. Even now such explanation is handy when no better is forthcoming. Hypocrites? Yes; Christ did call them by that hard name, but the probability is that the hypocrisy he detected and denounced was something lying much deeper than the vice to which we give the name. There is no evidence that the Scribes and Pharisees were, speaking generally, men of evil lives, or hypocrites in the ordinary sense of the term. Paul was a strict Pharisee, but he claimed to have been sincere in his Pharisaism. "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth" (Acts xxvi. 9). Had the Pharisees lived nowadays, we might have defended them, saying how very good they were—"very narrow, bigoted, in fact, but that is almost a necessary consequence of intensity." Jesus Christ called them "Children of Hell." . . . "So the woes of the Gospel were hurled against men well known to be straining every nerve to attain an ideal of righteousness in which they most honestly believed."[1] It was not as immoral or as hypocritical that Christ denounced them, but as spiritually proud, arrogant,

[1] "Pro Christo et Ecclesia," pp. 6, 17, 41.

circumscribers, and limiters of the favour of God. They sinned against charity and love, and against God, for they put arbitrary bounds to the Divine love. "The sin Christ detested was not the separation of truth from observance, but the spiritual pride that could not separate them." The Jewish Church, in its pride and exclusiveness, was a Monopolist Church. There is the "leaven of the Pharisees," of which we have to beware, as well as the leaven of the Kingdom of Heaven. This leaven worked in the Judaising emissaries who tracked Paul's steps and tried to undo his work, and it is working now.

Once for all, let it be said that our quarrel is not with persons, but with principles. While we hold with Coleridge that Catholicism, as an exclusive Church principle, is anti-Catholic,[1] yet we gladly acknowledge that many, both in the Roman and Anglican communions, have been saintly, with a saintliness that commands our reverence and excites to holy emulation. Denude our libraries of the books that we owe to the fathers, the doctors, and the saints of these two great Churches, and the gaps in our shelves would bear mournful witness to the greatness of our loss. Who would willingly part with "Thomas à Kempis" or the "Recit d'une Sœur"? Blot from our minds the thoughts they have given us, and deprive us of the stimulus we have derived from the record of their lives and work, and our impoverishment would be pitiable. But still it must be said: All the sanctity they attained, and all they have done for us, was attained, and has been done, by virtue of the Christianity of Christ, and not by the exclusive

[1] "Aids to Reflection," 1836, p. 204.

Church principle. They were what they were in despite of that principle. So to-day it gives us comfort to know that there are hundreds of faithful parish priests in England busily engaged in breaking the bread of life to their people, and little heeding the pretensions their co-religionists are putting forth, and the antics they are playing before high heaven. All this is granted. But none the less, the system these devoted men belong to claims them, and they cannot dissociate themselves from responsibility for that system. We have a right to know whether they avow or disavow the principle their Master condemned.

Principal Fairbairn has remarked more than once: "The higher the theory of the Church, the meaner is its conception of God. It cannot be otherwise." So the Monopolist Church belittles God by circumscribing and, as it were, shutting Him up within a narrow area, and confining His work of grace to certain prescribed forms of agency, material and personal. It materialises and depraves the idea of the Kingdom, and causes it to shrink within the petty limits of a particular church, and thus it excludes from the Kingdom some of the most excellent of the earth.

Of all monopolies, the attempted monopoly of grace is surely the most objectionable, and the most averse from the Kingdom of God. Judged by its fruits, it stands condemned. In what is known as "Clericalism" we have one of its developments; and here the virus of Ultramontane Catholicism has come to a head. Clericalism is the very imposthume of the Monopolist Church. Happily, we in this country know little of it except in its mildest form. To many,

indeed, the word "Clericalism" will suggest nothing more dangerous than a certain professional tone of voice or manner, united with a certain cut of vest or collar. But on the Continent, and especially in France, they have reason to know well both Clericalism and the sworn, implacable foe it has provoked into existence—anti-Clericalism. Virulence is here met by an opposed virulence even greater than its own. Not even in the days of the Encyclopædists and the Revolution was the anti-clerical feeling more bitter in France than it is to-day. Nor can we be greatly surprised at this when we read Mr. Conybeare's recent books, and learn how unscrupulously the more fanatical supporters of Papal pretensions have intrigued to defeat the ends of justice in the terrible Dreyfus case, and to stir up hatred against the Protestant and the Jew, to undermine the Republic, and generally to play the part of a secret and sinister influence. If, as in Judæa at the beginning of the Christian era, the Church's supposed interests are placed before the claims of religion, the divorce between religion and morality will soon follow.[1]

That is a fine scene in Hamlet which describes the obsequies of poor Ophelia. Being distraught, she had drowned herself, and therefore should have had by Church-law burial worse than that of a dog; but high authority has secured for her burial in consecrated ground. More than this cannot be conceded, and even this is yielded grudgingly and under protest. "We should," says the priest,

[1] F. C. Conybeare, "The Dreyfus Case," 1899, and "Roman Catholicism as a Factor in European Politics," 1901.

"Profane the service of the dead
To sing a requiem and such rest to her
As to peace-parted souls."

Laertes, ireful, answers:

"Lay her i' the earth,
And from her unpolluted flesh
May violets spring! I tell thee, churlish priest,
A ministering angel shall my sister be
When thou liest howling."

In this ancient "burial scandal," as in some nineteenth-century ones we can recall, we get a glimpse of Clericalism, and of the spirit of antagonism it calls forth. Monopolist Churches make "churlish priests," and churlish priests make wrathful Laertes. We may well pray that God would keep us from both Clericalism and anti-Clericalism, such as confront each other on the Continent. Yet bigotry is not dead by any means, though in his sermon in 1795, at the founding of the London Missionary Society, Dr. Bogue said "they were there to attend its funeral." At its beginning, the century witnessed a heated controversy, which lasted some fifteen years, on two questions—first, whether it was expedient for Churchmen and Dissenters to unite in circulating the Scriptures; and secondly, whether it was desirable, under any circumstances, that they should be circulated without the Book of Common Prayer.[1] The century ended, or, to speak more correctly, the twentieth century began, with loud outcries from a portion of the

[1] Skeats, "History of the Free Churches of England," p. 516. Skeats says there are preserved in the library of the Bible Society twenty-four volumes of pamphlets dealing with this controversy. He had read one-half of them.

High Church press against clergymen taking part with Dissenters in memorial services for the Queen, or in associating themselves with an undenominational movement for civilising the "Hooligans" of the Metropolis. All this is pitiable enough, but is what might be expected when you have one Church aspiring to become Monopolist.

CHAPTER III

THE GROWTH OF THE CONCEPTION OF THE KINGDOM

IT is with the growth of the *conception* of the Kingdom particularly that we have now to do, not with the deep, underlying causes that account for the conception itself so growing and spreading. Christ's favourite word now enjoys a vogue relatively much greater than it enjoyed half a century ago or earlier. This opinion will, we think, be endorsed by those who have been familiar with the staple products of the pulpit and the religious press for the last forty or fifty years, or who by reading have made themselves conversant with the ruling conceptions and terminology of religious writers in the early decades of the century. The literature of the Kingdom is augmenting at a rapid rate. Book after book appears dealing with some aspect of the great subject; and the word Kingdom in its Christly sense occurs with such frequency in our current religious literature, and in sermons and public addresses, that it has become "familiar in our mouths as household words."

How is the change in the Church's *usus loquendi* to be explained? Apart from those real causes

which will have to be considered later on, such as the silent revolution (for that is the word for it) which has been effected by the acceptance of the truth of the immanence of God, there are practical reasons discernible quite sufficient to account for and justify the wider adoption of the term Kingdom.

Words, alike in their birth and flourishing, and in their decline and obsolescence, obey subtle laws which work in the general mind. So, almost instinctively, the minds of Christian men are reverting more and more to Christ's own word, in order—(1) To escape from the ambiguities and logomachies attaching to that servant of all work, that word of many meanings—the word Church, and in order to have a convenient term which, as needing no qualification or addition, may take the place of that unsatisfactory expression, "Invisible Church." No need to say the "true" or "real" Kingdom of God. It *is* true and real. It includes none who should be excluded; it excludes none who should be included. There is no need, in order to deal fairly with the term, that we should, even in thought, get rid of "undesirables," as is the case with the word Church. (2) Christian men do not want to be always disputing as to what constitutes the true Church, and where it is to be found. The Kingdom of God may be known when seen; so, by the word Kingdom, those who care more that the will of God should be done than that absolutist ecclesiastics should have their way, utter their implied protest, and seek to get clear from the pretensions of the Monopolist Churches into another region and atmosphere altogether. (3) Christian men are finding the need of a wider, higher

synthesis, which will not only embrace what is genuine in all the Churches, but include and claim for Christ all good wherever it may be found.

The "man in the street" has come to be an important personage in our time. He surely must be Macaulay's wonderful schoolboy—about whom we heard so much in the early Victorian era—now arrived at man's estate. He is considered and appealed to on all sides and at every turn. What he thinks is regarded as a matter of some consequence, and his judgments are quoted as carrying considerable weight. There are signs that the "man in the street" is making himself felt in influential quarters, for we read in a novel the other day that a new halfpenny paper had been launched called the *Morning Drum*. In its prospectus the public were informed that the *Morning Drum* was to be edited and written by men with the mind of the "man in the street." So we have travelled on a little since a famous weekly announced that it was to be "written by gentlemen for gentlemen."

If the "man in the street" is to be regarded as the personification of the average man of the workaday world, we must not forget the "man in the pew," who, in no less striking a way, represents the mind of the average man of the religious but non-theological world, or, to speak more accurately, of the Kingdom of God; for to him the Kingdom is a favourite conception, and he is in the habit of using it as a test and as a convenient head of classification. The "man in the pew" is a plain man, not learned in the learning of the schools; but his native shrewdness makes his judgments on church matters valuable, though at

times they are apt to be rather disconcerting. Moreover, his unsophisticated moral sense does not relish verbal quibbles and subtle, unreal distinctions, and he is wont to brush these aside and get to things "just as they are." Sometimes the "man in the pew" keeps a diary, and we happen, no matter how, to have got hold of a recent page or two of this diary, in which one can see how the idea of the Kingdom is working amongst men, how the strength of the idea lies in its practical value, how it widens the area open to Christian activity and stimulates to effort; above all, how it guides the robust but untutored intelligence of the average Christian man through the complexities of our time, and helps him to clear the false issues which are so apt to be raised.

Thursday, January 16, 189—.—Met with X——. We talked about the vast amount of energy the pastor of the Baptist Tabernacle is throwing into social work; especially how he is giving daily breakfasts to hundreds of starving children. X—— tells me that most part of the church, headed by Deacon Stern, complain bitterly that all this social work brings no grist, either of money or souls, to the mill, that it does not build up the church, that it is wearing out the pastor; and, as a consequence, that he is not preaching half as well as he used to do, and that there is talk of getting rid of him. I said to X—— that it seemed to me, whether such work as feeding starving bairns built up the church or not, it certainly built up the Kingdom of God. I went on to say that I had read somewhere how that "Nature abhorred a vacuum," and so I thought the Kingdom of God abhorred the very idea of hungry stomachs, especially when they were children's, and would do its best to

fill them. X——, I thought, seemed rather shocked at my plain way of putting the thing, and suddenly remembered he had a call to make. N.B.—The pastor of the Tabernacle is going the way the Master went. I shall pray hard for him, and give him a helping hand, if I can.

Friday, *March* 2, 189—.—Dropped in at W——'s. Found him busy reading the week's *Christian Intelligencer*. He handed me the sheet, calling my attention to the "News of the Churches," which was very full this week. "There are signs of great activity amongst the Churches?" said he, in a sort of questioning way, after I had glanced over the columns. "Yes," was my reply, "there seems to be a good deal going on in the brick-and-mortar line. I see, too, a good many bazaars have been held. Some ministers are reported sick, and some as happily recovered, and various ministerial fixtures are chronicled. Committees also, I notice, have been in full blast. All this is very well; but don't you think, W——, that all this mainly relates to machinery and scaffolding, and belongs to what one might call Churchianity, rather than to the Kingdom of God? Our preacher last Sunday told us of a curate who found fault with a young lady who had been visiting the sick, and who finished his fault-finding by asking, "Why can't you do something religious—embroider an altar-cloth or something?" "It seems to me," I went on to say, "that we had better look at home. Holding bazaars and building chapels are religious work, just as putting up a factory is business. We would like to know what is done afterwards in the factory or the chapel. I make no doubt that the editor of the *Intelligencer* would like more intelligence of a different sort sent to him, such as he could put under the old heading, 'The Work of God,' or under a new heading, 'News of the Kingdom of God.'" And so home, resolving to pray that there

might be plenty of news of the right sort to send to anxious editors, and wondering if I could not find an acceptable item or two about what is being done in this corner of our vineyard.

Monday, May 2, 189—.—Have been, as John Bunyan would say, "greatly tumbled up and down in my mind."

As it was Monday, I made bold to look in upon my minister, who, I will say, always seems glad to see me. He kindly took me into his study, and after a little talk, he took down from the shelf two very different books, and read two passages from them. One book was the sermons of the great and good Wesley, and the passage my minister read was to the effect that no action performed by an unregenerate man could possibly be good in the highest sense. It might be good as profitable to men, but not good in the sense of being well-pleasing to God. And then the passage wound up by what the minister called a syllogism, which seemed to leave no doubt about the matter, and I could almost imagine I saw John Wesley with an air of triumph, as he said "There! Have not I proved my contention up to the hilt?" I was sorely puzzled, and I confess it was with a feeling of relief that I listened to the reading of the other passage, which I found was from a book by Cardinal Newman. I was relieved, because it does not matter so much what cardinals of the Romish Church may say, and one expects to disagree with them. It was a queer passage, contrasting a beggar-woman with the State's pattern man. The beggar-woman was pictured as lazy, ragged, filthy, and not over-scrupulous of truth, but as chaste and sober and cheerful, and as going to her religious duties; the State's pattern man was pictured as just, upright, generous, honourable and conscientious, but not from a supernatural power; and the Cardinal claimed that the beggar-woman would have a prospect of heaven quite closed and

refused to the State's pattern man. After the reading, my minister seemed curious to know my thoughts, and as though he would like to draw me out; and, indeed, I had my say, for though I was a little bound at first, I soon got liberty, and spoke my mind freely. I think my minister was pleased, though he did not say much; for at parting he gripped my hand tighter than usual, and thanked me for my visit. I cannot put down here all that I said; but I remembered that John Wesley had said somewhere that "no man is absolutely in a state of nature," and so although an action may not be good in the higest sense, it may still be good in a real sense, because God is the joint author of it. Yesterday I saw a workman share his dinner with a poor fellow who had none, and not long since I saw a man leap into the canal and bring out a drowning child. I don't know whether these two were converted or not, but I am sure that they did good deeds which belonged to the Kingdom of God, and I think God approved of those actions, as most assuredly I did. If deeds of mercy don't belong of right to the Kingdom, where are they to be put? The best is of God and from God, and so also is the lower good. I thought much of these things, and resolved to stick to Wesley, the large-hearted Christian, rather than to Wesley, the logician. N.B.—Where is that passage that gave me comfort? Find out.

The reading of these extracts from the diary of "the man in the pew" may appear to be a mere interlude, but we altogether misconceive their true bearing if they do not show, in a pictorial way, that the idea of the Kingdom is one of the most practical and powerful ideas of our time, and that men have been driven back upon this idea by the logic of facts as well as principles. Viewed in this light, the situa-

tion presented is similar to that in which the Apostles found themselves; for we hold with Dr. Denny, Professor Orr, and others, that it was not dogmatic reasons so much as historical or practical reasons which explain why the Apostles seemed to let the idea of the Kingdom be replaced by the idea of the Church. We may even seem to ourselves to be able dimly to discern some of those exigent circumstances out of which grew the practical reasons why "Church" rather than "Kingdom" took the front place in the Apostles' working conceptions. Leaving on one side the view of Dr. Russell and Principal Brown, that Christ truly came at the destruction of Jerusalem to take His great power and reign, may we not say that, when the Apostles wrote, the Kingdom was little in evidence beyond the confines of the scattered churches which shone as points of light amid the surrounding darkness? That may seem to be largely true even now; it was immeasurably truer when Paul wrote the first chapters of his letter to the Romans. Then, again, might not the prevailing or exclusive use of such a word as Kingdom at that time have been attended with considerable risk, as liable to be misconstrued by the ill-informed, or taken hold of by the evil designing, because implying the idea of divided allegiance and disloyalty?

There are, we know, writers, and some of considerable eminence, who do not go in this direction to find reasons for the change of terminology we are now considering. They think the Apostles, and notably St. Paul, failed to apprehend Christ's mind and teaching, and therefore, hardly knowing what they did, largely let go Christ's favourite word and con-

ception. Even Dr. John Watson can gently chide, or one might say, rally, the Apostle for his shortcomings in this respect: "The Kingdom idea flourishes in every corner of the three Gospels, and languishes in the Acts and Epistles, while the Church idea is practically non-existent in Jesus' sermons, but saturates the letters of St. Paul. This means that the idea which unites has been forgotten; the idea which separates has been magnified. With all respect to the ablest Apostle of Jesus, one may be allowed to express his regret that St. Paul had not said less about the Church and more about the Kingdom."

To us it seems more credible that the Apostles, and especially St. Paul, took the line they did, swayed by practical reasons. If so, then they and we stand in an analogous position, and act similarly in allowing ourselves to be determined by practical considerations; only, in our case, we are reviving Christ's idea of the Kingdom, while the Apostles allowed that idea to take a secondary place.

The Gaining of a Truer and Worthier Idea of the Church.

But no review of the century would be complete that did not take note of the fact that, while the idea of the Kingdom has grown apace, the idea also of the Church as the Apostles conceived it, so far from being neglected or thrust aside, has had a kind of renaissance among the Free Churches in the closing years of the century. Kingdom has not displaced Church in the thought of men, even of those men who

most resent the exclusive pretensions of the Catholic Churches, and who have watched the unhealthy growth of such pretensions with undisguised alarm as being a distortion of the true idea of the Church. On the contrary, what claims our interested attention is, that the leaders of thought in the Evangelical communions hold the two ideas of Church and Kingdom together in a natural and harmonious synthesis. The one is not thought of without the other; each is regarded as necessary and complementary to the other. The Church is recognised as the Capital of the Kingdom; as the Kingdom embodied, organised, and as organised for the advancement of the Kingdom. The deeper reasons for this notable change of thought and feeling that marked the closing years of the century will be indicated later on; enough now to emphasise the fact and extent of such change. A worthier, grander conception of the Church has taken the place of the somewhat mean and inadequate conception that once sufficed. It is not long since what has been called the atomistic idea of the Church prevailed, when it was regarded as a mere temporary association of individuals for religious purposes, for which no better word could be found than "Society," or "Connection," as though it were a piece of ecclesiastical joinery, a thing of boards more or less cleverly put together by nails or mortices. Even now we do not grow restive when the toast "To the ministers of other denominations" is given, though, as Dean Stanley observed at the opening of the City Temple in 1874: "'Denomination' is an entirely modern, and, grammatically speaking, rather

barbarous word." Some of us heartily agree with this dictum, and find the word getting almost unpronounceable. Dean Stanley "much preferred the word 'communions' to 'denominations.'" Agreed again! but the word "Church" is shorter and better, though "communion" makes an admirable second for occasional use.[1] The Wesleyan Conference of 1893 took a right and significant step when, on behalf of its tens of thousands of communicants, it officially declared itself a "Church." If it be not a true Church with all the "notes" that a Paul would look for, where shall a true Church be found? Methodism, as Isaac Taylor long since pointed out, offers a capital instance for the Apostolic-succession theory to try itself upon. That theory must either break itself upon Methodism, or its advocates must not flinch from the consequences to which their theory leads, and so "must consign Methodism and its millions of souls to perdition, in as peremptory a manner as that in which the Church of Rome fixes its anathema upon heretical nations."[2]

What are known as "The Three Denominations," *i.e.*, the Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists, have always called themselves "Churches." At the beginning of the century, speaking generally, the Churches they believed in were text-made Churches. Nothing was to be tolerated in the constitution and ordering of a Church for which Scripture warrant could not be given. Foundations, superstructure, outline, and finishing—all was to be according to the

[1] Dawson: "Joseph Parker, D.D., His Life and Ministry," p. 92.

[2] Isaac Taylor: "Wesley and Methodism," 1851, p. 133.

pattern supposed to be given in the New Testament. Such a theory was narrow, and, quite as much as doctrinal differences, this theory as to the absolute worth and obligation of one particular form of Church polity, as enjoined in the New Testament, tended to keep the Churches apart. Who holds this theory now? Even Rome has to fall back upon the theory of tradition to justify the position she takes. It has been reserved for the grandsons of those who believed in text-made Churches to rise to a conception of the Church far above and beyond the thought of their grandsires. And yet this larger conception now winning its way is Scriptural, as the other conception never was: for it is the idea of the Church as outlined by Paul in his Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians. We have even lived to see the rise of a High Church party in Congregationalism, represented by such men as the late Dr. C. A. Berry, whose address from the chair of the Congregational Union in 1897, on "Congregational Churchmanship," was a remarkable deliverance. "We are," affirms Dr. Berry, "living members of an organism, not loose atoms wandering in eternal isolation." In touching upon the Sacraments in the same address, the speaker passed a long way beyond the Zwinglian view of the Lord's Supper as merely a commemorative rite. He claimed it "as a means of specially close and gracious communion with the Christ whose Real Presence gives to it its true significance. Not as a commemorative rite merely, but as a communicative channel, do we preserve and fulfil this sacred service."

Dr. P. F. Forsyth, too, has laid the Free Churches of our land under great obligations by the loftiness of

his teaching concerning the Church. In him there is a remarkable blend of qualities. He unites the breadth and catholicity of the Alexandrian school with the individualism and strong grip of the doctrines of grace that marked the theology of Augustine of Hippo. In Dr. Forsyth we see a much-needed synthesis of thought already effected—a synthesis to which we are working, and to which he will help us to attain. Most great teachers have only one word to give us, but in the strength of that one word we can travel far. Dr. Forsyth's great word is "Grace." In 1892 Dr. Dale wrote: "Forsyth said a good thing the other day—'he thought that the time had come to get back the word Grace into our preaching.'" That word he *has* got back into his preaching and into his books. Moreover, it has been given to him, more than to most other Free Church writers, to have the power to quicken that spiritual imagination in which he is so great a believer. He is doing much to open the eyes of Free Churchmen to realise the richness of their evangelical inheritance, in danger of being but lightly esteemed. Many dull of imagination are impressed with what the great historic Churches have to show—noble fanes, hoary with age and redolent with memories of the long-distant past; a noble liturgy, rich vestments, and stately ceremonial; the adhesion of the great and powerful. Impressed with these things, they become depressed, and complain, "What have we not lost? Is not our Nonconformity costing us too dear? In comparison with all this, is *it* not bare, cold, mean, and new as with the newness of yesterday?" Dr. Forsyth has shown

them that their faith associates them with the glorified Christ, and that they belong to a spiritual communion which embraces other worlds, and stretches back to a time compared with which the founding of Westminster is a modern event. "Lord, I pray Thee, open his eyes that he may see," is a very appropriate prayer for many a young person in our Churches. We want them to know something of what it means to "belong to the Church"; what a lineage they have, and into what wealth of privilege and fellowship, and ancient inheritance, they are brought by the act of faith. All honour and success to such men as Dr. Forsyth, who are praying the prophet's prayer, and doing their best to answer it by couching the eyes of the imaginatively blind.

Dr. Dale has expressed the opinion that the Evangelical Revival "failed to assign the Church its true place in the spiritual life." He charges it with "disparaging or ignoring the function of organised religious society for education and for discipline." The defect thus pointed out has been largely made good; much has been done by those who have entered into the inheritance of the Evangelical Revival in filling out their conception of the Church, and rendering it more adequate. In proof of this, a reference to the Free Church Catechism may be permitted. When the representatives of the various Free Churches, to whom had been entrusted the delicate task of preparing the Catechism, came to face the definition of "the Church," they boldly asked: "What is the Holy Catholic Church?" The form the question takes is very significant, and the answer given is admirable in itself, and will compare

favourably with definitions found elsewhere. "It is," says the Catechism, "that holy society of believers in Christ Jesus which He founded, of which He is the only head, and in which He dwells by His Spirit; so that, though made up of many communions, organised in various modes, and scattered throughout the world, it is yet one in Him."

Though pertinent to the point in hand, we can say little here concerning the material side of the Church movement of the century; of the multiplication of sanctuaries and schools; of the striking general improvement in the architectural character of the buildings, and in their adaptability for the purposes of worship and various forms of Christian work; or of the equally striking improvement in the æsthetics of public worship. The progress made in all these respects has been truly marvellous; and when one tries to think of what all this material advance represents in the aggregate, it seems almost wrong to dismiss the subject in few words. If Mary's act of spending the precious ointment of spikenard on Christ merited being spoken of as a memorial of her to the end of time, we may rest assured that the liberality, zeal, toil, self-sacrifice which, in ten thousands of instances, have taken material form and expression, are worthy of our grateful recognition, and shall not fail of their ultimate reward.

We have bigger, better, more beautiful fabrics than our fathers knew. Our duty is plain; we must take care that our buildings are not better than the men who built and worship in them. It will be a standing reproach to us if, in their fair and goodly proportions, they but dwarf and put to shame the meanness of

our ideals of life and duty. We must rather see to it that at their best they shall but typify, in a poor and imperfect way, the height, and breadth, and excellence of our conception of the Church of our glorified Lord.

CHAPTER IV

THE BEGINNING OF THE CENTURY: THE KINGDOM AS SALT

The Beginning of the Century—"The Day of the Lord."

When did the nineteenth century begin? In 1801, say our almanacs and history books. But the Zeitgeist does not keep her eye on the great time-clock, and regulate her movements thereby. Epochs do not round themselves off with the close of the centuries; or if they do, the coincidence is but accidental. So if it is a new epoch we are in search of rather than a new century, we shall have to go forward a few years and fix upon 1830, rather than 1801, as our starting-point. Mark Pattison makes the second period of the rationalistic movement end about 1830, with the publication of the "Tracts for the Times," though, as he is careful to remind us, chronology can never be "exactly applied to the mutations of opinion." It is indeed remarkable how many important events occurred in or about the same year. We have Catholic Emancipation in 1829; the Revolution of July in France in 1830; the Reform Bill Movement in 1831-2; the founding of the Congregational Union in

1831; besides, the beginning of the Oxford Movement already referred to. It was an unsettled, yeasty time, when counter-principles wrestled for the mastery; when old things were passing away, and new things were struggling to the birth.

It lies quite beyond our purpose to write the history of the first three decades of the century. All that is needful to be done is to convey some adequate idea of the outward conditions in which the Church and the Kingdom of God were placed; what was the *milieu* in which the Kingdom did its work as salt and fire, as sword and seed and leaven; and how, even in doing this, it was acted upon by some of the powerful forces of the time, which thus became auxiliaries of the Kingdom.

The period in question was one of reaction from the hopes inspired by the French Revolution. Young and ardent souls, like Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Southey, hailed the fall of the Bastille with enthusiasm.

> "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive;
> But to be young was very heaven."

So wrote Wordsworth in 1789. But how different was the language he used in 1803, when the disillusionment of Wordsworth and his friends was complete!

> "I find nothing great:
> Nothing is left which I can venerate;
> So that almost a doubt within me springs
> Of Providence. Such emptiness at length
> Seems at the heart of all things."

Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Southey were but types of thousands more in the upper and middle classes. They who had professed themselves republicans were driven by the excesses of the Revolution into the Conservative camp, and became opponents of Reform and Catholic Emancipation. The spirit of reaction was met by the spirit of revolt amongst those who, as yet, had no political power, but who suffered terribly in the dark days that followed Waterloo. One calamity followed hard on the heels of another. We have to note a succession of bad harvests and bread standing at famine prices; the iniquitous Corn Laws of 1815, restricting the import of corn until its home-price was 80s. per quarter; a huge national debt and excessive taxation mounting up to 30s. a head; the effects of the Enclosure Acts, that dispossessed many a humble son of the soil; the far-reaching results of the industrial revolution—the exchange of domestic manufacture for the factory system, an overstocked labour market and over-production; the commercial crash of 1825-26, which ruined Sir Walter Scott, and changed for the worse the fortunes of young Cobden. Misery led to unrest, disaffection, agitation, even to violence. At different times, and in various parts of the country, bands of exasperated and half-starved men resorted to machine-breaking, rick-burning, and plug-drawing.[1]

We have the great advantage of knowing what were the impressions made upon the minds of such watchmen as Arnold, of Rugby, and John Foster, the

[1] *I.e.*, drawing the plugs out of the boilers at the mills and at the works where machinery was manufactured.

essayist, as they looked out upon these things that were happening around them. Arnold, especially, was greatly concerned at the grave aspect of affairs. To him the signs of the times seemed to "bode some strange eruption to the State." Writing to his friend, J. T. Coleridge, in November, 1830, Arnold declares: "The aspect of the times is, to my mind, really awful"; and writing to his sister in the same month, he says: "The paramount interest of public affairs outweighs with me even the school itself, and I think not unreasonably, for the school and all would go to the dogs if the convulsion which I dread really comes to pass. I must write a pamphlet in the holidays, or I shall burst. No one seems to understand our dangers, or at least to speak them out manfully."[1] While Arnold was writing in this strain, John Foster (November, 1830) thus declares his views concerning the situation at home and abroad:

"I am sure you cannot fail to contemplate with great and serious interest the portentous aspect of the affairs of the nations. There is coming into action, on a vast scale, a principle of change and commotion, of hostility, hatred, and defiance to the old-established order of things, which absolutely can never be quieted or quelled; which must be progressive with augmenting knowledge, but which, in pervading and actuating a mass so dreadfully corrupt as mankind in *every* nation, must inevitably, while a Righteous Governor presides over the world, be accompanied in its progress by awful commotions and inflictions. My settled impression is that the rising generation are destined to witness a process

[1] Stanley, "Life of Arnold."

more tremendous than all that their predecessors have beheld." Writing still in the same year, he speaks of "the *mobility* so visible in the state of the world, the trembling and cracking of parts of the old fabric; the prostration of some of the inveterate tyrannies. These are surely signs that the changing and meliorating process is at least beginning."[1]

So the great Nonconformist thinker, in his almost cloistered seclusion near Bristol, and the Broad Churchman and publicist of Rugby School, are remarkably agreed as to the interesting and momentous character of the period between 1830-33, though, indeed, the Nonconformist looks out on the turmoil with something more of faith and hope than his fellow-watcher. To both of them it was "the consummation of the age," or "the juncture of eras," as Isaac Taylor renders it. In his correspondence of this time, Arnold more than once refers to his conviction that "the day of the Lord" is coming, *i.e.*, the termination of one of the αἰῶνες of the human race. He notes how, in the first century, when the Jewish Æon ended, and also in the fifth and sixth centuries, when the Roman Æon came to a close, there was a concurrence of calamities, wars, tumults, pestilences, earthquakes, etc., all marking the time of one of God's peculiar seasons of visitation; and, says he: "Society in Europe seems going on fast for a similar revolution, out of which Christ's Church will emerge in a new position, purified, I trust, and strengthened

[1] "Life and Correspondence of John Foster." Edited by J E. Ryland, M.A. Vol. ii., p. 70.

by the destruction of various earthly and evil mixtures that have corrupted it."

The fact we wish to place in a clear light by means of indisputable evidence is that the England of 1830 was on the very verge of revolution; and to raise the question, "What saved her from the threatening calamity?" One of the most ominous features of this time, so "out of joint," was the mutual distrust and antagonism between class and class that prevailed to an alarming degree. Readers of "John Halifax, Gentleman" may remember a passage in which this feature of the early part of the century is faithfully depicted: "Between the upper and lower classes there was a great gulf fixed; the rich ground the faces of the poor; the poor hated, yet meanly succumbed to, the rich. Neither had Christianity enough boldly to cross the line of demarcation and prove—the humbler that they were men, the higher and wiser that they were gentlemen." Charles Kingsley, too, in his preface to a later edition of "Alton Locke," confirms this judgment. He speaks of the "hateful severance between classes, little known before, that came in with the French Revolution." He asks: "Had invasion threatened us at any period between 1815 and 1830, or even later, would any ministry have dared to allow volunteer regiments? Would they have been justified in doing so, even if they had dared?" In closing his preface, he fervently exclaims: "Return to the system of 1800-30 is, I thank God, impossible."

There is no need to tell once again the story of the Reform struggle of 1831-32. Enough to say

that by the Reform Bill of 1832 a beginning was made in the democratising of our institutions, and that this beginning was made by the way of evolution, and not of revolution; and we express our strong conviction that it was largely owing to religion that disaster was averted, and the path of evolution followed. Historians are agreed that in the pre-Reform days England was in a parlous state, and that she might easily have gone the way France went in 1789. As one says: "Rarely have the omens threatened civil disturbance more than in the England of 1830."[1] It was, we repeat, religion which averted the omens, and not accident, or even the supposed law-abiding and conservative instincts of the English people.

The Kingdom as Salt.

"And He went forth unto the spring of the waters, and cast the salt in there. . . . So the waters were healed unto this day." —2 Kings ii. 21, 22.

When we say that Religion, or the Kingdom of God, was, in the early part of the century, as salt to the body politic, arresting the process of decay and acting as a curative and salutary influence, we must not stop short with abstractions, but must go on to persons, and give to them the credit of doing this praiseworthy and needful work. Let us beware of these abstractions. "*Ye* are the salt of the earth," said Christ to His disciples. It is religious persons who are the salt of a community or nation, and they are this

[1] J. Holland Rose, M.A., "The Rise of Democracy," p. 38.

because they are brought into close and sympathetic touch with their fellows. Not only must the salt have its peculiar savour and virtue, but its virtue must go out of it; the salt must be applied where most needed. Just recently the salt-cure has been proclaimed as the last specific against consumption. A hypodermic injection of salt water into the veins day by day will, we are told, reinvigorate the sluggish nerve-centres; sleep will come back, appetite return, and weight be gained. All this, whether it can be scientifically verified or not, is a parable of what those who have "salt in themselves" may do for those around them. One such family may sweeten a whole court of an East End slum, and its removal from that court is for those who are left a misfortune. Two or three godly workmen may raise the tone of a colliery village, and act as a restraining and stimulating influence. In the light of the parable of the salt, we can learn the secret of the good work done by the University Settlements that form so remarkable a feature of the Christian philanthropy of our time.

As we have seen, England's danger in the early part of the century lay in the neglect and oppression and miseries of the poor. Those evils, unremedied, meant probable disaster to the whole social organism. The healing salt was sorely needed. Who were the persons, or what religious bodies were they who came into close and sympathetic touch with the downtrodden? Who brought the gospel of salvation and comfort to the poor, and by so doing conferred an untold and lasting benefit on the community at large? We say that it was Religion, which exerted a restraining and controlling influence in the

crisis of 1830-32, and ensured that henceforth, from the small beginnings of liberty then gained, freedom should broaden down from precedent to precedent; that the redress of wrongs and the gaining of rights should come by constitutional means, and not by violence. Religious men must have been at the head of this democratic movement, and we would like to know who they were, and to what class and community they belonged, in order that we may honour them for their works' sake. History can answer these questions, and we will put her to the question.

It was not religion, as represented by the National Church, that can lay claim to this honour. Though the Evangelical movement had done much to revive and purify the Church of the Establishment, and though the Evangelicals throughout the first four decades of the century were the dominant party, yet, as a party, they allied themselves with those who stoutly resisted change. Even Wilberforce, the head of the Clapham Sect, who gave himself to the noble task of securing the liberation of the West Indian slaves—even he opposed the removal of Roman Catholic disabilities, and the granting of larger toleration to Dissenters. Because it is but common justice to affirm that many of the Anglican Church of to-day are amongst the most enthusiastic and self-sacrificing workers amongst and for the poor and the distressed, we must not forget the plain, emphatic verdict of history. Lecky tells us: "It is remarkable that while England and France have been the two nations which have undoubtedly done most for the political emancipation of mankind, they have also been those in which the National Churches

were most bitterly opposed to freedom." [1] So also Dr. Guinness Rogers, after observing that the Evangelicals of the Anglican Church have, from the first, more or less identified themselves with Conservatism, goes on to remark that: "For the most part the Evangelicals, clergy and laity alike, have regarded the liberal and progressive tendencies of the age with an alarm scarcely less disquieting than that of the Ultramontane himself." [2] But the heaviest indictment we remember to have read of the general attitude taken by the National Church towards social questions, and the welfare of the people in the earlier part of the century, is by an Anglican clergyman. It occurs in "Reminiscences chiefly of Towns, Villages, and Schools," by Thomas Mozley, a relative of Cardinal Newman, and brother of Canon Mozley, the theologian. Thomas Mozley was not only a beneficed clergyman but a prolific leader-writer on the *Times*, and its special correspondent in Rome during the Vatican Council. Mozley died in 1893, at the age of 87, and we find his volumes of "Reminiscences" valuable for the light they cast on the condition of England during the early decades of the century. But to return to Mozley's indictment of his own Church. The passage is too long to be quoted in full, but the following extract very fairly represents its tenor:

"For the greater part of my life I have frequently thought over a great and distressing fact, which

[1] "The Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe," vol. ii., p. 191.

[2] "Church Systems in the Nineteenth Century," p. 149.

seemed to me quite unaccountable, and the worst of all scandals to the cause of Christ in this country. Our blessed Lord's ministry and discourses all denote that the Kingdom of Heaven means the improvement, the elevation, the purification, the emancipation of mankind. . . . The Church of England had a divine commission and charter for all these works, and might have been foremost in them. She might have pointed to the British Empire, as Augustus to his marble city, and said what she had found, and what she had left—except that she does not leave. In this great and combined movement for good, the Church has not been to the front ; she has not tried to take the lead ; she has, generally speaking, taken the contrary part, by obstructing, depreciating, and minimising the good work undertaken by others. Her plan lay in other lines. She sought to strengthen herself by alliance with powerful interests, not by a hold on the affections of the people, not by doing His will on earth as it is done in heaven.

"It was by necessity that the common rank of the clergy and their lay friends had to confine themselves to local spheres and narrow lines. The philanthropical movements that began with this century for the education of all classes, for the diffusion of useful knowledge, for emancipation and reform, for colonisation, emigration, and even missions to the heathen, had been chiefly promoted by Liberals and Dissenters. These had the lead, and they used the lead to have the choice of the methods and ways.

"Looking back to the earlier part of my conscious and rational existence, I must say that I do not think there has been any age in the world in which humanity, justice, and common sense were more subordinated to established interests, and more trodden underfoot by them. Yet this was under the wealthiest and, in many respects, the most powerful ecclesiastical establish-

ment which the great revolutionary movement had left to the world."—(Vol. ii., 441-3.)

Neither can it be said that in the first quarter of the century the orthodox Dissenters felt themselves to have any special mission to the unenfranchised and neglected classes. Dr. Stoughton tells us that amongst the Congregationalists ecclesiastical and doctrinal conservatism prevailed. The predominant views were strongly Calvinistic, and the divine authority of Independency was strictly maintained.[1] Thus Presbyterian innovations were dreaded as much as Armenian encroachments. Congregationalism was staid, sleek, eminently respectable, and had great influence amongst the powerful middle class, especially in London and the large towns. When Thomas Binney came into the old King's Weigh House pulpit in 1829, "the ministry of Independency was a kind of florid frost-work, in which religious truth was held in a cold crystallisation of sanctified Chesterfieldism, for ever fearing to offend."[2]

Even before 1830 there were in Congregationalism men of more liberal and progressive views. They were moderate Calvinists of the school of Dr. Williams and Andrew Fuller, and it was the growing influence of such men which resulted in the formation of the Congregational Union. The first meeting of the Union was held in 1831, in the Congregational Library, Bloomfield Street, the chief room of a building that had been a concert-room, and now adapted for

[1] J. Stoughton, D.D., "Reminiscences of Congregationalism Fifty Years Ago," 1881, pp. 17, 18.

[2] E. Paxton Hood, "Thomas Binney: His Mind, Life, and Opinions," p. 7.

Congregational purposes. The accommodation here provided amply sufficed for the modest requirements of the Union meetings, until the numbers attending so increased that a migration was made to historic Crosby Hall. Here first began the custom of delivering those carefully prepared presidential addresses which are so important a feature of the Assemblies. After 1830, what may be called a real revival was experienced by the Congregationalists and Baptists. Many of their adherents in large towns increased in wealth and social influence, and much liberality was shown in the support of missions, the erection of chapels, and in the employment of agencies, public and private. Concurrently with these signs of material and social advance, the denominations were favoured with a gratifying increase of religious life and power.[1]

It should, however, be remembered that Congregationalism has always laid claim to have a special mission to the intelligent middle classes. Now that Congregationalism is inaugurating its own forward movements, this claim may not be put forth so prominently or acknowledged even by some Con-

[1] See Stoughton, "Religion in England," vol. ii., p. 152. The Rev. C. A. Whittick, M.A., in his "The Church of England and Recent Religious Thought" remarks on this revival that, "unlike the previous Methodist revival, it was very little, if at all, due to the spiritual apathy of the Church of England. That Church was, in fact, herself engaged in taking up a new position at the same time. Undoubtedly, however, the tardy awakenment of the National Church to the practical wants of the time was a source of strength to the Dissenters. Or rather, we should say that as the Church addressed itself to meet one set of wants and the Dissenters another, the *immediate* advantage lay on the side of those who aimed at satisfying the more immediate wants."

gregationalists when it is made; yet there can, we think, be no question that this is the old tradition of the genius and function of Congregationalism. This was strikingly brought out at the International Congregational Council held in 1891. At this Council a speech was given by President Northrop of Minneapolis, in which he maintained that the intellect was the special province of American Congregationalism, and reproached his English brethren for a disposition to neglect the claims of the mind in matters of religion. "There are," said he, "organisations that go down and reach the lower classes and lift them up. God bless them! But that has never been the spiritual province of the Congregational Church, and it is not likely to be in the future."

What made this deliverance the more significant was the fact that it was fully endorsed by Dr. Dale in the Introduction he wrote to the proceedings of the Council. The gist of his appreciative comments on President Northrop's declaration is found in these words: "It is the special duty of Congregationalists so to present the Christian Gospel as to draw to Christ those who are never likely to be reached by the Salvation Army, and to discipline them to the highest intellectual and ethical perfection. The truth is that the Americans have retained the old Congregational tradition."[1]

Thus, by a sort of exhaustive process, we reach the conclusion that to that form of religion known as Methodism must have been assigned the high duty of acting as the salt of the Kingdom; to reach

[1] "Life of Dr. Dale," pp. 612, 613.

and deal honestly and lovingly with those whose ill-requited labour and poverty, whose ignorance and lack of guidance, whose unredressed wrongs and practical serfdom, made them a reproach and menace and source of danger to the Commonwealth. Now we have been told so often and so long, that we are not likely to forget it, that our mission is to the lower classes; that we were raised up by God to go to those who were neglected, or, at any rate, not reached by other agency. So far as the intention of Divine Providence in regard to our denomination may be inferred from its history, it would seem this view as to our mission, at least during the first thirty or forty years of our denominational life, is correct. It is not true to-day. The existence and work of the Salvation Army since 1878 is a sufficient proof that what was true in 1830, when we were a Mission, is not true of us in 1901, when we are a completely organised and fully equipped Church, able not only instrumentally to make converts, but, to use Dr. Dale's own words, to discipline the converts we have made to the highest intellectual and ethical perfection.

We admit the contention of our friends and enemies alike, that our denomination was plebeian in its origin and mission. Our founders and fathers belonged to the "common people," and lived and laboured and died amongst the "common people," who were of little account then, but later on were to come into their long-deferred inheritance. Ecclesiastically, the "Ranters" in those days might be "the end of the dish-clout," as we once heard it put; but then to the dish-clout is assigned the lowly, but

necessary, work of cleansing the poor man's table-dishes, be they of delf or pewter—and that is something. The "Ranters" reached the residuum; the Primitives kept the platter clean.

We have a perfect right to take the consequences of the admission forced upon us, and make of it an argument in order to reach a conclusion that denominationally does us much honour, but which has never been presented as it deserves to be. Our fathers were patriots as well as evangelists, for they were in a measure the saviours of society, because they supplied an antiseptic to the festering sores of that section of society which was most let alone, and whose letting alone meant grave peril to the rest. They largely helped to check the anti-social, disintegrating forces that were at work in the new century; to soften class-feuds and ward off riot, revolt, and revolution; to show an example of temperance and thrift, and lead the way to self-help and co-operation; to prevent then and thereafter the forced and unnatural separation of Religion and Liberty, and to make it clear that the Kingdom of God is not alien from true progress and the welfare of the commonalty—the masses as well as the classes.

As a specimen of the evidence which has been collected in support of our position, and which will be presented to the public in due course, let us give an extract from a book written in 1873, by Mr. Robert Fynes, which deals with the social and political struggles of the miners of Northumberland and Durham. As will be seen from the quotation, Mr. Fynes writes from the standpoint of one outside

our Communion, and therefore his testimony has all the greater value.

"Unsatisfactory though the moral and intellectual condition of the miner is to-day, yet compared with his condition at the period treated in the opening chapters of this book [the beginning of the century], there is a miraculous change. Side by side with the Union, the earnest men who have been stigmatised 'Ranters,'—the Primitive Methodists of the two counties—have been working out the social, intellectual, and moral amelioration of the miners, and in this great reform they have been very materially assisted by the temperance advocates who have from time to time laboured amongst the miners. No doubt there were many zealots in both bodies, many, indeed, that were positively bigots; but if taken generally, it will be found that they were respectable, earnest, intelligent, truth-seeking men, who, having got a glimmering of the truth, and having become enlightened with intellectual light themselves, were anxious to carry the glad tidings of truth to their still benighted brethren, and to endeavour to lighten their great darkness. Probably no body of men have ever been subjected to so many jibes and sneers from superficial people as those referred to, but without doubt none ever achieved such glorious results as they have done. To many it may be a matter of supreme indifference what is the exact creed professed by Primitive Methodists; but whether they have a creed or none at all, it is impossible for any observing man not to see and admire the bold and ardent manner in which they carry on their labours amongst the miners. Most of the pitmen nowadays think either more or less for themselves; half a century ago it was otherwise. But the Primitive Methodists induced many of them to reflect, and the result of

that reflection was speedily manifest in the outward garb of the man. He took to going to chapel, and finding it necessary to appear decently there, he got new clothes, and became what is termed 'respectable.' In the abstract, perhaps, this was no great improvement; but there was also a great change wrought in the man himself, for in place of spending his time and his money idly in the public-house, he was brought by the influence of the 'Ranters' and the 'Teetotalers' to acquire some little self-pride, which gave place to a desire for learning, which had to be gratified. Men who had grown up and had children old enough to go to school have been sitting side by side on a form learning the very rudiments of reading and writing; and those bodies who could work out such a great and glorious reform as this deserve respect and admiration rather than contempt, however zealous or even bigoted some of their individual members may have been."—(Pp. 282-3.)

When from Northumbria we turn to East Anglia, we there find similar testimony borne by Dr. Jessop, Canon of Norwich, as to the good work our people have done, and are doing, in the Eastern Counties. The genial and scholarly Canon winds up his enumeration of the benefits "the stuffy little chapels by the wayside" have conferred on hundreds of parishes in these words: "What the Society of Jesus was among the more cultured classes in the sixteenth century, what the Friars were to the masses in the towns during the thirteenth, that the Primitive Methodists are in a fair way of becoming among the labouring classes of East Anglia in our own time."[1]

[1] Dr. Jessop, "Arcady, for Better for Worse," p. 78.

Once more. Look at the agricultural counties of Wilts, Berks, and North Hants, where, in the early thirties, Primitive Methodist missionaries suffered their heaviest persecutions. As has recently been pointed out,[1] these "poor preachers of the nineteenth century," as Professor Thorold Rogers has aptly called them, were preparing the way for that greater uprising of the agricultural labourer under the leadership of Joseph Arch, himself a local preacher. The founding of the National Agricultural Labourers' Union in 1872 began the emancipation of the rural labourers. But this movement of the seventies had a close connection with the religious propaganda of the thirties, and probably followed as a natural sequel; for what was true of other districts obtained here also. It was, to a large extent, from the ranks of the local preachers that the labourers got their leaders, trained in public speech and the conduct of debate.

The case is heard, and we submit,—the plea must be sustained. We have a grander history than our published records hitherto have shown—one that has close relations to our wider national history. England owes more than she knows to the plain Primitives who played their part in critical times.

[1] By Mr. J. W. Turner in the "Aldersgate Magazine," 1900, p. 699.

CHAPTER V

SOME AUXILIARIES OF THE KINGDOM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

IN the Revelation we read "the earth helped the woman." This means "the world helped the Church"; so, we believe, all expositors are agreed. But who precisely are the parties to the pact thus described, and how, and on what terms, is the help afforded and received? These are the questions. Some—as, for instance, Professor Milligan—hold that what is shadowed forth is the truth, that the World loves its own, and that when the Church has compromised herself by becoming worldly, the World will not hesitate to lend countenance and support to the Church. An unholy alliance is struck up, reflecting little honour on either the World or the Church, but most discreditable to the latter. Needless to say, history affords many illustrations of such unnatural alliances, ranging from the union of Church and State, with all the evils such union has entailed, down to the temporary coalition for political purposes of "beer and Bible."

But, as we have seen, when we speak of the world we must distinguish. There is the World of the anti-Kingdom, with which no terms can be made by the

Church without a sacrifice of principle; and there is the world of nature and of human activity, working in normal ways and for legitimate ends. From the world in this sense the Church may receive help without loss of honour or breach of trust, and the forces thus providentially placed at her disposal she may leaven and assimilate, and use for the purposes of the Kingdom. In this sense it has often been true that "the earth has helped the woman." Or leaving symbolic language of somewhat doubtful import, we may see the legitimacy of employing such auxiliaries in the service of the Kingdom, and the fact of such employment foreshadowed, in the words of Christ: "For he that is not against us is on our part."

One of the most striking instances of a great world-movement becoming auxiliary to the service of the Kingdom is afforded by what is known as the Renaissance—the intellectual movement of the fifteenth century. Then, in the striking words of the historian, "Greece rose from the grave with the New Testament in her hand." The movement was not at first specially religious or spiritual; indeed, it was what we would call secular. It had its origin in the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, and the consequent dispersion of Greek scholars, carrying with them the precious manuscripts of classical antiquity. As the scattering of the disciples after the death of Stephen led to the revival of religion, so the scattering of the scholars after the fall of Constantinople led to the revival of learning in Europe. Men's minds were quickened, and Humanism began. But the movement, which in its beginning was purely secular, soon became religious. The revival of learning resulted in

the revival of religion by means of the better understanding and multiplication of the Word of God. Scholars turned with eagerness to the study of the Scriptures as well as of the classics. They prepared and published editions of the Old and New Testaments in the original tongues, and then in the language of the people. The invention of movable types quickly followed to spread abroad the Word of God; and so the printer with his printing-press as well as the scholar with his manuscripts, became the auxiliaries and instruments of the Kingdom. The Renaissance, then, is a capital instance to remind us that, though the distinction between things secular and things sacred is a convenient one, the antithesis between them may be more formal than real, as so many of our sharply-drawn antitheses often are. The currents of thought and feeling that play upon the Kingdom of God are often subdued and made tributary to the purposes of that Kingdom, just as the dyer's hand is subdued to that in which it works.

What the Renaissance was in the fifteenth century, such largely was the movement known as Romanticism at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century. Mr. Theodore Watts-Dunton has called it "The renascence of the spirit of wonder in poetry and art." True as this is, so far as it goes, it seems too close and narrow a description of a movement so wide and penetrating as to leave few departments of human thought and endeavour uninfluenced. Literature, art, politics, religion, all felt its vivifying breath, and were reanimated and suffused with a fresh glow and colour. Speaking generally, Romanticism was a reaction from the prosaic and

commonplace; from the limited outlook, the formality, and cold correctness of the eighteenth century. More particularly it was a reaction from the Revolution and all its works; and as a reaction, it naturally tended to conservatism and absolutism in politics and religion. Men could not, or would not, distinguish between the principles which the Revolution vindicated, and the lamentable excesses which outraged those principles; and so they set themselves stiffly in array against the principles themselves, instead of trying to disengage them from their accidental entanglements. As the Renaissance was a return to the age of classical literature, so Romanticism sought to get back to the Middle Ages—the ages of devotion and chivalry, when Imagination wandered over the land uttering herself in poetry and song, and Faith built her glorious cathedrals and worshipped therein. Though Romanticism may be said to have had its rise in Germany, its influence soon spread to other lands. In France it had its exemplars in Lamartine, Chateaubriand, Montalembert, Lamennais, and especially in Victor Hugo.

In England, Romanticism may be said to have reached its climax about the epoch year—1830. It gave a new character to literature, especially to poetry and romance, and a new feeling for history. Keen observers had, in the earlier years of the century, noted how contemptuously men thought and spoke of the past; as though the ages precedent were not worth thinking or writing about, and as though the true ancients were the latest born of time, and the depositaries of all wisdom. All this was now changed. The eighteenth century was belittled, and the Middle

Ages glorified. Romanticism breathed in the poetry of Wordsworth and Southey, Coleridge and Keats. In painting it gave rise to the pre-Raphaelite school; and in architecture the Gothic revival and the building and restoration of fabrics were the outcome of its influence. Sir W. Scott's novels were written under its inspiration, and the author of "Waverley" and "The Lady of the Lake" was only one of the greatest of a school that had its representatives as well in Germany and France as in Great Britain. These writers made the past live again—the days of chivalry, when knights jousted at the tournament, and fair maids buckled on the sword of the warrior, and monks sang vespers amid the Gothic arches, or gave alms at the gate of the refectory. In all this there might be a good deal of glamour and unreality, but, none the less, it afforded a welcome change from the *borné* and utilitarian mode of looking at things it superseded. Mr. Arthur Balfour has expressed a strong preference for the eighteenth century, rather than for the nineteenth; but we confess we cannot share his preference, and the admission he makes but seems to suggest, what some of his works also indicate, that he has affinities with the Aufklärung. When we turn from Pope to Wordsworth, we seem to breathe a different atmosphere, and experience a feeling of relief. What makes Carlyle such wholesome and stimulating reading is that the very spirit of Romanticism has entered into him, and pervades his teaching. As we read his pages, written in a style which betrays that it was "made in Germany," we are made to feel the vastness and wonder of the universe, and the solemnity that attaches to life.

Common things are no longer common and mean, but full of a strange significance. It may be sooty Manchester we are surveying and thinking of, but sooty Manchester — it, too, is built on the infinite abysses, overspread by the skyey firmaments ; and there is birth in it, and death in it ; and it is every whit as wonderful, as fearful, as unimaginable as the oldest Salem or prophetic city. Go, or stand, in what time, or what place we will, are there not immensities, eternities over us, around us, in us :

> "Solemn before us,
> Veiled the dark Portal,
> Goal of all mortal :—
> Stars silent rest o'er us,
> Graves under us silent."

We have to do with Romanticism, in so far as, like the Renaissance, it came to blend with the religious life of the century, and to leave its impress thereon ; or, in other words, we have to do with it as it came to be an auxiliary of the Kingdom. That it did so is beyond a doubt, and is a fact admitted by writers of very different schools. Coleridge, as Pfleiderer observes, was "the first and most influential representative of the new tendency in England." [1] In him were united intellect and feeling, reason and faith, so that he seemed in turn to discharge the dissimilar functions, now of championing the faith against the assaults of anti-religious rationalism, and then of contending for a more liberal interpretation of traditional doctrine. What were united in him others put asunder, and each

[1] Pfleiderer, "Development of Theology since Kant, etc." p. 354.

appropriated that side of Coleridge which suited him best. This is no fancy-picture, but the statement of what actually took place at Oxford in the early years of the century. The process went on in Oriel College, where a group of student-friends were in residence. Whately, Thomas Arnold, Hampden, and Baden Powell derived from Coleridge their rationalising tendency; while in the case of Keble, Richard Hurrell Froude, and Newman, it was Coleridge the defender of the faith who impressed and influenced them. What, however, was common both to the Noetics of Oriel, as they were called, and the Newmanites, was the influence derived from Romanticism through the medium of Coleridge and others. Thus we have the interesting fact that Romanticism had its part in the inception of two of the great tendencies of thought which have so much occupied the attention of men—Broad Churchism and Anglo-Catholicism. In Charles Kingsley and in Thomas Hughes; in the former's "Hereward the Wake" and his other books, and in the latter's "Tom Brown's School Days," and "Tom Brown at Oxford"; in the "muscular Christianity" they have the credit of setting forth, we have the manly, chivalric characteristics so congenial to Romanticism, persisting and reasserting themselves. As for the Oxford movement and its indebtedness to the same tendency, it may be enough to point to an interesting passage in the "Apologia," in which Newman at some length expressly refers to the influence which Sir Walter Scott, Coleridge, Southey, and Wordsworth had indirectly exerted in helping on the "movement," which he considers as "a reaction from the dry and superficial character of the religious

teaching and the literature of the last generation, or century, and as a result of the need which was felt both by the hearts and the intellects of the nation for a deeper philosophy, and as the evidence and as the partial fulfilment of that need, to which even the chief authors of the then generation had borne witness."

But more: were we to say that the new feeling for History which Romanticism brought in has resulted in taking us back to the historic Christ, we should be stating but the simple truth; and Principal Fairbairn has told us how this precious result has been reached. Men who closely scanned the great personages of the past, intent upon seeing them in their habit as they lived, and finding out what was the secret of the influence they exerted, were soon confronted with the most commanding, the unique figure of all time. This was inevitable. There was no escaping from Christ, and the duty of classing and placing Him. History could not be understood if His character, claims, and work were not investigated. "What think ye of Christ?" "What shall I do, then, with Jesus, which is called Christ?" These were practically the questions which would not be evaded, but forced themselves on the attention of men. The Naturalist theory of Paulus (1828), the Mythical theory of Strauss (1835 and 1840), the Tendency theory of Baur (1845), were so many successive attempts to answer these questions; to account for Christ, or to explain the origins of the Gospel and the Church. Beside the voluminous literature these theories have produced, numberless Lives of Christ have issued from the press, of very varying degrees of merit, since they include such widely dissimilar

books as Renan's sentimental romance and, in many respects, the still valuable "Ecce Homo" (1865). All this shows how urgent is the problem raised by the fact of Christ. What, then, is the outcome of all this investigation and discussion? It is quite true that in all controversy on such vital matters there will of necessity be some loss; but without indulging in any mere rhetoric of the platform, we venture to assert that in this instance the gain has been incalculable. We have got a more real Christ. We have been led to Him by a way we could not have foreseen, or have chosen, had it been put to us. And now, thanks both to the friends and avowed opponents of Christ, we can look upon Him from a nearer distance; not through a traditionary haze, but as it were face to face. It is now some years since the late Professor Elmslie asked, "What has criticism done in these last years?" and then proceeded to answer, in his own vigorous way, the question he had put. Much has happened since he wrote these lines, and the battle still rages; but the conflict has narrowed — it does not range over so wide a field, and Professor Elmslie's words are still true in essentials. "I will tell you," says he, "what the critics are doing: they are, step by step, as each new unbelieving theory comes up, making one more pathway of escape from Christ impossible. Where is the Christ of Paulus? Where is the Christ of Strauss? Where is the Christ of Schenkel? Where is the Christ of Renan? There is not a cultivated German or critic who believes in one of them, and what have these critics done? Why, by a method of elimination, they are shutting up the heart of

humanity and the intelligence of the age to this: there is no other explanation of Christ's power than the old, old one—that He was perfect man and perfect God, the world's Saviour, the Son of God."

The *Church Times* recently declared that the sons of the Puritans have lost their Bible. It would be truer to say that the sons of the Puritans have lost their bibliolatry and found their Bible. Like Christ, the Bible has become more real, because more human and intimately familiar. The old superstitious feeling which led men to consult the Bible for the purpose of divination, as even John Wesley occasionally did, may have gone; but their reverence for it as the Word of God, as showing the way of salvation, and as the directory of life, remains.

Dr. Pearson has somewhere compared the Bible to one solid, perfect crystal without crack or flaw. Such a conception has been made almost unthinkable in these days by that same historical spirit whose origin we have traced. Instead of one crystal block, the Bible is rather like a necklace of pearls of varying size strung on one long time-string and clasped together in unity. Our admiration of the Book is not lessened, but rather increased, as we see how, instead of dropping down from heaven like a miraculous stone, it has been put together at "sundry times and in divers manners"; and yet how, from Genesis to Revelation, it witnesses for God, and has its abiding message for man. We know well that the extravagances of some of the Higher Critics have a good deal to answer for. We say *some* of the Higher Critics, for we would distinguish. The some publish in hot haste their crude speculations as though they

were stamped with the hall-mark of verified conclusions, and those who cannot discern between the specious and the genuine, and who defer to great names, are filled with uneasiness, as though the ground were crumbling beneath their feet. We are no advocates of "economy" in regard to the truth; but if the truth is to be taught, let us be sure of it and ourselves before we begin to teach. Thinkings aloud are better reserved for the privacy of the study. They should not in hot haste be confided to the printing press, or uttered under the sounding-board of a pulpit, though it should be the pulpit of a cathedral. For the transition time in which we are living, when one conception of the Bible is being replaced by another and, as we think, a higher conception, it will be well for us habitually to practise Bible reading for devotional purposes; so shall we then be less liable to be shaken in our confidence by what men may say as to the mode of composition of the Word of God. Of this we are sure, that the historical spirit has not robbed the sons of the Puritans of their Bible, but has put more meaning into it, and enhanced its preciousness.

In another way, and that not the least remarkable, the historical spirit, reinforced by the scientific doctrine of evolution, has given us a new conception of man—of the organic oneness of the race. One need not give his adhesion to all the theories which, under the name of laws, are said to govern the evolutionary process in order to admit the general truth of evolution. The universe is one. Men may, by successive acts of abstraction, break up this unity. They may give names to the abstractions they have made, and even form them

into sciences; but still the world is a concrete whole, and things want thinking together, for they exist together. This particular man, for instance, cannot well be explained without reference to all that has gone before in time; and in space he exists as no isolated phenomenon, but is related to all that is. What Tennyson profoundly said of the "flower in the crannied wall" is still truer of the *man* who takes the flower into his hand:

> "I pluck you out of the crannies;
> Hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
> Little flower—but if I could understand
> What you are, root and all, and all in all,
> I should know what God and man is."

Fruitful beyond measure, as regards the Kingdom of God, is the thought of the organic unity of the race. Its influence is searching and salutary, and destined to spread more and more. In quarters where one would least expect to find it, its influence is felt. For example, a recent writer on archæology has shown that the popularity of this science is owing to the human interest which attaches to the remains of antiquity, and that it was reserved for the nineteenth century to make the discovery that "human nature is much the same, whether in the ancient or the modern world."

Between Industrialism, which, since its origin in the beginning of the century, has advanced with such gigantic steps, and the Kingdom of God, there might seem to be little relation other than that of antagonism; while with Mammon, "the least erected spirit that fell from heaven," its relation might seem to be one of near affinity. Many of the gravest problems which

perplex and almost baffle the social reformer—such as the rapid depletion of our villages and the question of the housing of the poor in our overcrowded cities —are largely traceable to the demands of industrial life. And yet there is another side to Industrialism. It has created opportunities as well as difficulties; greatly helped as well as hindered. Some of the most characteristic products of our modern civilisation have been, and may become still more, the auxiliaries of the Kingdom. The lucifer match and the locomotive, the postal service, the newspaper, the telegraph, have all played their part. To refer to the humblest of these creations of the century for a moment, even such a serious writer as Isaac Taylor has not disdained to refer to "the introduction and universal use of lucifer matches as among the stimulants of civilisation. . . . The septuagenarian student, who remembers well his winter morning's conflict with flint and steel, and tinder-box, and brimstone match, will own that he has won fifteen minutes for his books through six months of the year by aid of the lucifer match—an infallible candle-lighter in three seconds!"[1] Thus the lucifer match, by economising time, has practically lengthened life. As to the locomotive, it has not proved such a leveller as might have been expected. On the contrary, its influence has tended very largely to specialisation by strengthening class and sectional differences. By affording the means of cheap and rapid conveyance, the drawbacks inseparable from local isolation have been overcome. Men scattered up and down the country, of similar views and sentiments, have been brought together in

[1] "Ultimate Civilisation, and other Essays," 1860, p. 12.

assemblies and conventions. By the facilities thus afforded for combination, new movements have gathered strength and momentum. Mr. Whittick has even attributed the success of the Anglo-Catholic propaganda in this country very largely to this cause;[1] and a similar obligation must be acknowledged on the part of the Free Church Federation, the Christian Endeavour, and other movements too numerous to mention. In the closing years of the century, great aggregate meetings have more and more tended to become a feature of our religious life, to focus opinion and generate enthusiasm.

It is needless to multiply instances; the mysterious forces of Nature and the resources of civilisation are not the Kingdom, but they wait to be the auxiliaries of the Kingdom. They are not the actual leaven, but they take kindly to the leaven. If not the light, they can be illumined, and thus, reflecting the light, they can increase the general illumination. There is nothing fortuitous; and if we believe that "through the ages one increasing purpose runs," then we must believe that discoveries and inventions are timed and fit into and subserve the final purpose of all. "Your free trade would have ruined you," said a thorough American protectionist to the late Thomas Mozley, "but for the accident of the gold discoveries, which cheapened the precious metals as fast as free trade cheapened corn." On this, Mozley remarks that he never heard a stronger testimony to the presence of the Almighty ordering all things for the good of those that love Him and His laws. The whole passage is

[1] Whittick, "The Church of England and Recent Religious Thought," pp. 20-22.

interesting, though too long to quote in full. Mozley contends that ever since Drake's time it had been known that there were deposits of gold in California, and that there were gold-fields in Australia. The principle of the electric telegraph, too, had been known for over two centuries, and the application of it on a small scale was one of the amusements of his childhood; but until the fulness of time had come, "a hundred thousand philosophers of all nations were to stare at it even more stupidly than so many sheep gazing at an unknown intruder into their pasture, till it pleased the Almighty to open their eyes to better purpose." [1]

[1] Mozley, "Reminiscences, Chiefly of Towns," etc., vol. ii., pp. 349-51.

CHAPTER VI

THE KINGDOM AS LEAVEN

The Fatherhood of God.

Bad men may occasionally give good advice to men better than themselves. This was what Diderot the Encyclopædist did when he admonished the ecclesiastics of his day to get their idea of God enlarged. The admonition was needed; for the representatives of the Church in France, at that time, had succeeded but too well in identifying religion with the cause of privilege and absolutism both in Church and State, and in arraying against themselves and the religion they so unworthily represented the most progressive forces of the age. Thus once more we have an illustration of the law of irony in history—a law that Amiel was so fond of remarking the presence of in the affairs of men. We see Religion and Liberty in opposite camps: Voltaire the mocker championing the cause of toleration and vindicating the memory of the victim of religious persecution and popular fanaticism; and Diderot the atheist saying to the priests of the Christian religion, "*Elargissez Dieu.*"

Now if we may consider Diderot's words apart from Diderot himself, we shall be able to find in them a

significance almost prophetic; for the nineteenth century has succeeded in giving us a wider, worthier, truer conception of God. This has not been attained without the historic and glorified Christ; for it still remains true, and the efflux of time but adds to the significance of the words: "No one knoweth the Son save the Father; neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him" (Matt. xi. 27). Men have been brought nearer to the Christ of the Gospels, and to the Christ of experience, and have been taught of Him that God is the living Father of all men.

If there has been one thing in relation to the theological thought of the century more remarkable than another, it is the extent to which the truth of the Divine Fatherhood and its related truth has laid hold of the minds of men. With Dr. Fairbairn,[1] and in harmony with Christ's own declaration just given, we must hold that the thought of God is determinative of religion, and that it was the thought of God as His Father which was the regulative thought in the mind of Christ. In the sphere of Christ's consciousness, this was as the central sun round which all other thoughts revolved in truest harmony; and what was central to Christ must not be relegated to any outside or subordinate place, but must continue to be central in Christ's religion. Hence the truth of the Fatherhood of God, and its correlate, the brotherhood of man, are first and chief among the

[1] "The New Testament interpretation of Christ is in its ultimate analysis an interpretation of the Father in the terms of the Son."—"The Place of Christ in Modern Theology," p. 393.

truths of the Kingdom. This being so, it was very fitting that in the first published Hartley Lecture, Dr. Watson should discuss the subject of "The Fatherhood of God." With the views expressed by Dr. Watson in that lecture we are glad to find ourselves in full accord, and therefore need not now dwell on the more purely theological aspects of the subject. What we wish to point out and emphasise is, that to no truth pertaining to the Kingdom of Heaven is the figure of the leaven more strikingly appropriate than to this truth of the Divine Fatherhood. All through the century it has, like leaven, been working in the minds of men, silently and gradually winning its way to acceptance, overcoming antagonistic beliefs, assimilating what has lent itself to the assimilative process, and now, at last, in this our time, is becoming the dominant and determinative idea of theology.

We have implied that the leaven has had to meet with obstruction. This is true, and not to be wondered at. Ideas that are more akin to the old Federal theology than to the Gospel of the Divine Fatherhood do not easily quit their hold, and are perhaps responsible for the hesitancy which some feel in accepting the truth that because Christ is, in a unique sense, the Son of God and the root of humanity, therefore God is the Father of all men, though "specially of them that believe." Others who feel misgivings lest the acceptance of this truth should cut the nerve of that theology to which the atonement was a vital necessity, may dismiss their fears. Recent works by men whose loyalty to evangelical truth is unimpeachable show that the

doctrine of the atonement, in its deepest spiritual meaning, will quadrate with the Divine Fatherhood quite as well as with the Divine Sovereignty. God's love is a *holy* love, and He is the *righteous* Father. If there is progress in theology, so far as its determinative principle is concerned, the progress is not of such a kind as takes us beyond the need or sight of Christ and His Cross. Rather is it a progress into the deeper experience of that need, and the clearer vision and interpretation of the fact for which that Cross stands.[1]

"Have you a bigger God than you had twenty years ago?" recently asked an eminent Egyptologist of one much younger than himself. He was anxious to know whether true progress had been made by his friend during those years in which their paths had lain apart. Perhaps the earlier questions he had ventured to put had been too general; at any rate, the answers returned did not seem fully to satisfy the aged Christian, so he came into close quarters, and touched the very heart of the matter in asking the question: "Have you a bigger God now than you had then?" It is difficult to evade or play with a question like this, and the question is for all of us a vital one. A man's conception of God determines his religion, and if that conception be poor and inadequate, it will reveal the same poverty and inadequacy when translated into life. What is true for the man is equally true for the generation or the century; for if, as the poet tells us:

"Men's thoughts are widened by the process of the suns,"

[1] See "The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement."—The Fernley Lecture for 1897. By J. Scott Lidgett, M.A.

this should hold good in the highest realm of thought, and the end of the century should find us with an enlarged conception of God, not, however, attained as the "long result of time"—by the process of the suns—but rather by "the process of Christ"; by the expansion and stretching forth of the mind to take in more and more of the compass of Christ's thought of the Father. This process, we repeat, has been going on through the century, and the progress of its leaven-like working can be traced in

The Decline of Calvinism

which made God the Father of the few, and left the many to be passed over by God; or, worse still, reserved them for a judgment they had no means of escaping. It must be acknowledged that Calvinism, with its doctrine of the divine will, "*irresistible* in its efficacy, *select* in its objects, and *persevering* in its results," served to obscure and even partially to nullify Christ's teachings concerning the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. As to God, it made Him partial and arbitrary in His bestowments. The God of John Calvin and Jonathan Edwards was not the Father of Christ,

> "Whose undistinguishing regard
> Was cast on Adam's fallen race."

As to man, it exalted the few at the expense of the many. True, it served to nurture a spiritual aristocracy of the finest type, but the mass of the non-elect it left in their helotry.

When the eighteenth century ended, the predominant type of religion was Calvinistic. The old High Church party, of course, was Armenian in sentiment, and so was Wesley and his followers; but the Evangelical Nonconformists were almost exclusively Calvinistic, as was the larger section of the Evangelical party in the Establishment. Thomas Scott's "Force of Truth" remains to show how conformable to Scripture and reason the Calvinistic system appeared to this man of vigorous understanding, to whom J. H. Newman acknowledged he, humanly speaking, almost owed his soul.

It is simply impossible for us at this day to conceive how protracted and fierce and bitter, was the controversy that once raged over "the five points" of Calvinism. If perchance we were to find ourselves in some old theological library, we might be helped somewhat to understand the dimensions to which this controversy attained; how much time and zeal and ability —to say nothing of brain-tissue and emotional force —was expended by the disputants on either side. We should see many a volume or polemic tract, once aflame with life, now fallen quite flat and dead. There they stand like the craters of extinct volcanoes amid a smiling landscape! Now it is difficult to stir a languid interest even in the history of a controversy which once so greatly agitated the minds of men. We cannot say that Calvinism has vanished. So long as certain ancient formularies remain, that cannot be, and we must remember that even to-day "revision" is a burning question among the Presbyterians of the United States; but if it has not vanished, it is fast vanishing, especially since the

spell of Spurgeon's influence has been withdrawn. Some of the old terms and phrases, such as "election," "the Divine sovereignty," "final perseverance," are still in use; but in a sense the framers of the Westminster Confession never intended, and would have scouted. A meaning drawn from the gospel of Free Grace and Divine Fatherhood is read into these terms. The old bottles still do duty, but it is the new wine of the Kingdom that is poured into them.[1]

As to the causes of the decline of Calvinism, it might be enough to say the leaven has been spreading. The new spirit of humanitarianism that has arisen is all against it. So is the deep-rooted conviction that God and man are so much akin that God's right cannot be man's wrong, or do him wrong. Views of God's character, against which the moral feeling of men instinctively rises in revolt, must go. We see how this principle works, and what logical cogency is latent in these moral intuitions, when we read the sentence with which Lorenzo Dow opens his book, "Reflections on the Love of God, on Predestination," etc. "After I had found religion, I began to reflect on my experience, and perceiving that I felt a love to ALL, though I had been taught that God only loved a FEW, I could not reconcile the two ideas together, how my love should exceed the love of God."[2]

Moderate Calvinism was an attempt to give a more liberal interpretation to the doctrines of the Westminster Confession. Its rise and spread during the early years of the century marked a stage in the

[1] See certain chapters in Dr. J. Watson's "Doctrines of Grace."
[2] "Bemersley." Printed by James Bourne, 1836.

decline of Calvinism. The founding of the Congregational Union was, as we have seen, brought about largely through the influence of men who had imbibed the new spirit. Theologians like Drs. Payne, Wardlaw, and Chalmers, sought to soften the harsher features of Calvinism. It was contended that election did not involve reprobation, and a subtle distinction was attempted to be drawn between the *sufficiency* and *efficiency* of the atonement. But these alleviations and modifications of the old system did not serve to arrest its decline. That decline has gone on with increasing rapidity, so that now even the views of moderate Calvinists, as expressed in the first half of the century, appear extreme and out of date. Moreover, unlike the system it sought to qualify and render more acceptable, moderate Calvinism could not claim to be a logical system. It did credit to the hearts of those who framed it, but it was wanting in self-consistency. Whatever may be alleged against Calvinism as it came from the hands of its makers, it certainly cannot be charged with being illogical. That acute thinker, Isaac Taylor, writing in the middle of the century, fully admits this: "Calvinism is a more compactly jointed system than Armenianism, and therefore it holds its ground boldly as opposed to its adversary. . . . Jonathan Edwards floors Whitby and the Pelagians." But its very excellence in this respect was its condemnation. It was too logical to satisfy heart or conscience.

So Taylor closes his essay on "Logic in Theology" with some strong words on Jonathan Edwards, with whom and whose "logic in theology" the essay is mainly concerned: "This unfeignedly Christian

man, from the peculiar structure of his mind, and from his training, had learned to abandon himself to the tyranny of a wordy, demonstrative method. Come what might, let all principles and all intuitions of piety and moral feeling be outraged, yet if the logic be right—if each proposition hangs fast by the heels of the proposition which is its precursor—if all be so, then a belief which is infinitely worse than the worst blasphemies of atheists is, without a doubt, to be taken to ourselves as true!" If we start with a false premiss, the closer and more consistent our reasoning, the more outrageous may be our conclusion. A wrong postulate about God's will or man's freedom may land us, by irrefragable logic, in a conclusion which may be nothing but a libel on God.

It was in Scotland Calvinism was most strongly entrenched, and here, therefore, the great fight has been waged, with what result we all rejoice to know. In bringing about this remarkable change, a conspicuous place must be assigned to Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, a layman of noble character and commanding ability. By his books, by his conversations and correspondence with such men as Bishop Ewing, Vinet, Alexander J. Scott, Dean Stanley, Maurice, Adolphe Monod, and J. M'Leod Campbell, he powerfully influenced those who, in this and other lands, did much to shape and direct the religious thought of their time. Who amongst us familiar with his books but will acknowledge that to Thomas Erskine they owe enlarged and clearer views of the simplicity of faith, the Fatherhood of God, and the freeness of His grace?

Erskine's first book was published in 1820, and bore

the title, "Remarks on the Internal Evidence for the Truth of Revealed Religion." This book was translated into French by the Duchess de Broglie in 1822, and a German translation appeared in 1825. In America, too, it excited a powerful influence, for we have the testimony of Dr. Noah Porter that this book did more than any other single book of its time to give character to the new phase of theology in New England which began about 1820, in which Dr. Lyman Beecher (the father of Henry Ward Beecher), Dr. Moses Stuart, and many others were concerned. This new theology was a revolt against the hard, rigorous Calvinism then holding sway, and the struggle between the two schools of thought led in 1838 to the disruption of the Presbyterian Church into two bodies—the so-called Old and New School Presbyterians. The two bodies came together again in 1869.

In 1828, Erskine's best-known book, "The Unconditional Freeness of the Gospel," was published, and helped forward the "disintegration of the granite mountain" of Calvinism then in procsss. Amongst the confidential friends of Erskine was J. M'Leod Campbell, of the Row. He was a saintly man, but fell under the discipline of the Church of Scotland. Erskine used to tell how his own gardener, who prided himself on the correctness of his belief, would admit that Mr. Campbell, of the Row, "was a vera guid man, but that he divairged [diverged]," as if after that there was no more to be said for him. The point of divergence was on the extent of the atonement. Campbell had preached the universality of Christ's atonement, and hence he and Scott were,

in 1831, excluded from the ministry of the Church of Scotland. Ten years after this, James Morison of Kilmarnock (afterwards Dr. Morison of Glasgow) and other three ministers were deposed by the United Secession Church for holding and publicly teaching God's love for all men, and the universality of the atonement. But even now Morison's emancipation was not complete. For two years he ranked as a Moderate Calvinist, and it was not until after various appeals had been made to him both by Armenians and staunch upholders of the Genevan doctrines that "he would extricate himself from a false position"; and not until he had submitted the doctrines of Calvinism to a renewed prayerful and critical examination that he came to see how unsatisfactory and illogical was this *via media* of Moderate Calvinism on which he was standing. Now he came clear out of the shadow cast by tradition, and in the full light now enjoyed he saw, as he expresses it: "That the Divine Spirit is in heart like the Divine Son, and the Divine Father; and since the Father does love all, and the Son did die for all, it cannot be the case that there is discord in the holy and happy Trinity, discord in the aims and operations of the divine persons. It cannot be the case that the holy and happy and loving Spirit really refuses to do His part in the great economy of mercy in behalf of millions upon millions of those whom the Father sincerely loves, and for whom the Saviour really died. No, this cannot be the case, for God is as truly harmony as He is Light and Love."[1]

Such thoroughgoing Free-grace views as these

[1] "Life of the Rev. James Morison, D.D.," pp. 236-7.

were made central in the declaration set forth by the Evangelical Union of Scotland formed at Kilmarnock in 1843. This newly-constituted Church contributed greatly to spread the leaven of truth in Scotland; and Dr. Morison (obit. 1893), whom we know as the scholar and distinguished commentator, but whom we should honour also as a confessor for the truth, and one of the most fervent evangelists Scotland has ever had, lived long enough to see the universal aspects of God in His Triune manifestation almost everywhere received and welcomed. Nor, in referring to the Evangelical Union, should we forget that it has given to the Church and Kingdom of God that powerful theologian and Christian philosopher, Principal Fairbairn.

It may seem an ungracious thing to dwell so long on the defects and darker side of Calvinism; but unless this were done, how can we deal fairly with the religious movements of the century, or gauge the extent of the progress that has been made? It is not that the decline of Calvinism is in itself a matter for rejoicing. That will only be if Christ's truth of the Divine Fatherhood—a truth which Calvinism did so much to obscure—has taken its place. "He must increase, but I must decrease," said John the Baptist of Christ. So if Calvinism's decrease means, historically, Christ's increase, well and good: we have reason to rejoice, for the good has been superseded by the better. And this, we believe, fairly represents what has been going on during the century—the gradual displacement of the less perfect by the more perfect and Christly conception of God.

But even while Calvinism is passing, let us do it

simple justice. It could, and did, produce fine and noble characters. Its theology was strong meat for strong men; or, to adapt Milton's words, it could raise

> "To height of noblest temper heroes old,
> Arming to battle; and instead of rage,
> Deliberate valour breathe, firm and unmoved
> With dread of death or foul retreat."

All this is true; but, as Bunyan may serve to remind us, the pilgrim-band was not altogether made up of men of heroic mould. Master Despondency and his daughter Much-afraid had their place in it as well as Valiant-for-the-Truth and Master Honest. Let us give a thought to these "bruised reeds and dimly burning lamps," to whom, in the days of His flesh, Christ was so tender. For these weaker ones Calvinism had to make provision; and it is morally certain that what appealed to certain souls, drawing out what was strongest in them, bore heavily on others of a different type. Many a soul-tragedy has been enacted in lowly homes where the theology of the decrees was a living power. Ecclesiastical history can take no account of these humble soul-tragedies, though the novelist may have found in the conflict between creed and natural feeling the *motif* of his story. Given diffident, trembling souls to whom the darker tenets of Calvinism were the truth of God, how could it be otherwise than that the mind should be racked with anxiety as to its personal relation to the inscrutable decree of God, or tortured yet more by questions which would obtrude, but could not be answered, as to what the predetermined will of God

was for children and loved ones? Were they, or were they not, already written in the number of the elect? Dr. George Macdonald has been sharply taken to task for "waging incessant war against what he considers the gloomy and forbidding system of Scottish Calvinism." It is alleged that "nearly all his books are polemical," and that "David Elginbrod," "Robert Falconer," and "Alec Forbes" are each of them little else in reality but "a theological manifesto, veiled under a thin disguise of character-sketching and story-telling."[1] Now, we hold no brief for George Macdonald, though we owe him more than we can tell; so while we hold that he has been serving the cause of the Kingdom in carrying on his lifelong crusade against Calvinism, yet we are ready to admit that, like Scott, he has often done it less than justice. It is not because Calvinism tended to foster hypocrisy that we are glad of its passing. Our quarrel with it is that to many a gentle, sincere soul it brought torturing dread and anxiety, that could find no warrant in Christ's truth about God.

"Pray for me, who cannot pray for myself or any other. Glad should I be could I say anything cheering as to the state of my soul, but it is not so. I doubt whether there has been any saving work in me. I sometimes get glimpses, but then they seem to be succeeded by great darkness, and I question their reality. O David, I have need of your prayers, that the Lord would show me His way, before He cause my feet to stumble on the dark mountain." We are

[1] S. Law Wilson, M.A., D.D., "The Theology of Modern Literature," p. 272.

not quoting from one of George Macdonald's stories, or from "John Ward, Preacher," or from any other novel with a polemic purpose. The pathetic lines just given are part of a letter written by an aged Christian to her son—the late Principal David Brown, D.D., whose life (1803-1897) almost spanned the century. She did not suffer from religious mania, but was a sincere, though doubting, Christian. Though she had two sons and three sons-in-law in the ministry, she only on one occasion heard any of them preach; for she belonged to a Church of the Original Secession, the ministry of which was highly evangelical, and the discipline enforced so strict that attendance upon the services of the Established Church was prohibited as a protest against its defections.[1] She lived in the shadow of the Genevan theology, and in that shadow went fearing all her days.

Instead of "Calvinism," we might throughout this chapter have spoken of "Augustinianism," for Calvin but inherited and reduced to logical consistency the predestination which Augustine originated. It is very singular and noteworthy that Augustine's name is closely associated with both Romish Church exclusiveness and with that other form of exclusiveness known as High Calvinism, which limits the Church to the elect. Principal Fairbairn notes the fact that the two systems of thought are inconsistent with each other, one being conditional and the other absolute, and that they owed their origin to the dualistic tendencies in Augustine's nature, and to the stress of controversy. "His theology was full of unreconciled antitheses.

[1] W. Blaikie, D.D., "David Brown, Professor and Principal of the Free Church College, Aberdeen. A Memoir," pp. 8, 9.

It reflects at once his intellect and his history; the dualism that was native in his soul is inherent in his system. He never transcended it in experience, and it always dominated his thought." "He was forced to develop the political form [of the Church] in his controversy with the Donatists, and the theological [*i.e.* predestinarianism] in his controversy with the Pelagians."[1] All this is exceedingly interesting, but what concerns us to notice is that Rome and the Reformers divided Augustine's inheritance between them; Rome taking the polity and the Reformers the theology. Rome has gone on steadily consolidating and perfecting her polity until, as we shall see, the process may be said to have reached its completion in the century that has gone. Augustine's theology, of which the Jesuits are ever the bitter foes, Rome has gone on rejecting or qualifying, until in the same nineteenth century it may be said to have received its official death-sentence. Yet, as Harnack maintains, Augustine's doctrines of grace still persist in the Church of Rome, and like precious seed, spring up here and there in lives of true saintliness.[2] The other half of Augustine's inheritance, in its form of the Calvinistic Theology, the nineteenth century has seen steadily declining, and now we may say, "It is ready to vanish away." Augustine has had a long reign, but so far as his theology is concerned, he has now fallen on evil days. But he has yet something to teach our age, and the theology of the future should attempt to combine what is most excellent in

[1] "Christ in Modern Theology," pp. 115, 116; also 155 and 543.

[2] Harnack's "What is Christianity?"

the theology alike of Augustine and of the broader, more sympathetic, and humane theology of the Alexandrian school, of which Clement, Athanasius, and even Origen may stand as the representative names.

CHAPTER VII

THE KINGDOM AS LEAVEN—(*Continued*)

INDIVIDUALISM SUPPLEMENTED BY ALTRUISM.

IN his "Apologia," J. H. Newman relates how, early in his life, he came under the influence of the Calvinistic creed. He was converted, and became convinced that he was elected to eternal glory. In a famous passage he goes on to describe what effect the acceptance of this belief had upon his own mind, viz., "In isolating me from the objects which surrounded me, in confirming me in my mistrust of the reality of material phenomena, and making me rest in the thought of two, and two only, absolute and luminously self-evident beings — myself and my Creator; for while I considered myself predestined to salvation, my mind did not dwell upon others, as fancying them simply passed over, not predestined to eternal death. I only thought of the mercy to myself." [1]

This passage will admirably serve the purpose of indicating the remarkable change that has taken place in the prevailing thought of men with regard to the mode of the Divine existence, and their natural

[1] "Apologia, pro Vita Sua," p. 4.

and moral relation to their fellows. To young Newman the sphere of his consciousness was filled by the thought of two "luminously self-evident beings" —God and himself. They were distinct, yet holding as close a relationship as sun and satellite. As the sun of his soul, Newman's God was TRANSCENDENT, not IMMANENT. Moreover, the world of things outside was, in comparison, as a dream or shadow; and as for other individuals, they were not despised, much less judged, but simply ignored. His mind was so preoccupied with the Eternal and with his own eternal interests that it did not let its thoughts dwell on them. He and they belonged to one system, if you will, but it was a system made up of worlds moving apart, and to be dealt with separately. So in this early phase of Newman's religion it took on the form of INDIVIDUALISM, rather than of ALTRUISM.

It is strange that an early and temporary phase in the religious life of one who ended as a cardinal in the Romish Church should lend itself for the illustration of what was at once the strength and defect of the Puritan type of character. But this it does; for we hold that the ultimate secret of Puritanism did not lie, as Matthew Arnold maintained it did, in its excessive zeal for the "three notable tenets of predestination, original sin, and justification." [1] Calvinist and Puritan are not convertible terms; for there were Armenian as well as Calvinistic Puritans. Even Mr. Matthew Arnold would class Methodists with the Puritans; and certainly they have not been remarkable for their excessive zeal for the notable doctrine of predestination, except it were

[1] "St. Paul and Protestantism," 1870, p. 1.

zeal for its extermination. No; we must look elsewhere to find the essence of the Puritan type of character, and with Dr. Martineau, Prof. Dowden, and Dr. R. W. Dale we would find it in "the intensity and vividness with which it has apprehended the immediate relationship of the regenerate to God." [1] The Anglican believed in a God who was mediated by the visible, and especially by the Church; while the Puritan held that the relation between the invisible soul and the invisible God was immediate.

We have spoken of the defect of the Puritan type of character. It was great and strong in its vivid realisation of God by the individual; but its danger and as succumbing to the danger—its defect lay in religion becoming too self-centred and individualistic in character. There can be little doubt that in the beginning of the century, and onwards into the fifties and sixties, the children of the Evangelical Revival needed to have their horizon enlarged. Too low views of the Church obtained; and the vision of the Kingdom of God, in its broad inclusiveness and with its imperious demand for service, had not so fully risen upon the minds of men. The uncircumcised scoffed at the "other-worldliness" of Christians. Some of our early hymns are intensely individualistic. Take as an example the lines:

> "Nothing is worth a thought beneath
> But how I may escape the death
> That never, never dies."

In proof of what is here alleged, it would be easy to call up witnesses to whom one cannot but listen

[1] R. W. Dale, "Essays and Addresses," p. 250.

respectfully. Dr. R. W. Dale was not wont to indulge in heedless rhetoric. He had a well-balanced judgment, and measured his words; yet in his sermon on the Evangelical Revival, preached at Birmingham in 1879 before the Wesleyan Conference, he boldly asserted that the Evangelical Revival had laid the whole stress on Individualism. The same assertion was repeated in other words in his "The Old Evangelicalism and the New." "The tendency to Individualism," he said, "which is one of the marks of the Evangelical Movement, appears in other directions. Although its leaders insisted very earnestly on the obligation of Christian men to live a divine and godly life, they had very little to say about the relations of the individual Christian to the general order of human society, or about the realisation of the Kingdom of God in all the various regions of human activity."[1]

If the judgment thus pronounced be a just one, it must be acknowledged a notable change has taken place. The "nothing is worth a thought beneath, but," etc., of the hymn has been largely supplemented. Too long have we been in arriving at the "also" of St. Paul's exhortation: "Look not every man on his own things, but every man *also* on the things of others." But the sentiment is stirring and becoming powerful that others are, after all, only our other selves, and that we ought to look on them and theirs with other eyes than those of cold indifference or greed. The sense of isolation is giving place to that of interdependence—to the feeling that we are parts of one common organism. Individualism or atomism, though it may still have many votaries, has few de-

[1] "The Old Evangelicalism and the New," p. 18.

fenders. We have even got a new word, dating from 1853, to designate the new feeling—the word ALTRUISM. The awakening has led to many heart-searchings. Men have a feeling of self-reproach, and stand almost aghast as they face such problems as the drink curse and the housing of the poor, and as they remember that their own reprehensible supineness have allowed unchecked Mammonism to make these problems even more intricate and threatening. Who does not remember the shock caused by the "Bitter Cry of Outcast London"? But the conscience of the Churches, Nonconformist and other, is being aroused. Witness the new enthusiasm for social amelioration; the heroism of our slum-workers and Sisters of the Poor, and the consecrated labour of the staff of our University settlements; the social work also of General Booth, to our thinking the most satisfactory part of the religious and philanthropic movement he has originated. Let us not forget, either, the gradual recognition by the Churches, not excepting our own, of the claims of the starving children, and the destitute and afflicted poor.

Did we speak just now of having arrived at Paul's pregnant word "also"? We correct ourselves. Let us not be deceived by our newly-aroused social enthusiasm. We believe with Amiel that "The evolution of humanity is nearer its origin than its close. The complete spiritualisation of the animal element in nature seems to be singularly difficult, and it is the task of our species. Its performance is hindered by error, evil, selfishness, and death, without counting telluric catastrophes. The edifice of a common happiness, a common science of morality

and justice, is sketched, but only sketched."[1] But we have got the idea of human solidarity, which is something; and we have the desire to bring it about, which is better still; and we know where the dynamic power for effecting it can be obtained, which is best of all.

The reaction from ultra-Individualism has gone far. We read the other day someone's assertion that "there is no such thing as a real individual." The assertion sounds startling, but is true enough in the sense the writer intended; for we are "all members one of another." Less paradoxical is it to assert that until we love our brother man, not because he is lovable or in any way attractive, but simply because he is made out of the same human stuff as we, we do not love him as Christ would have us love him, and as He has shown us how to love.

But we must be on our guard against chimerical projects, nor suffer ourselves to be beguiled by the much lauded nostrums offered for our acceptance as the specific against all the evils which afflict mankind. Especially must we turn a deaf ear to socialist theories, which find no place for Christ and His gospel of the Kingdom. They vaunt they will give us better bread than is made of wheat, but they will end by putting us off with a stone instead of bread. Let religious teachers, too, keep their heads, and write and speak the words of truth and soberness. Just now some men are going so far as to contend that to love one's neighbour as one's self is not the law of the Kingdom, and that Christ never intended it to be such. That, it is said, was simply the Jewish law of

[1] "Amiel's Journal," p. 256.

justice, but that Christ laid down the higher law when He said: "A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you." In short, we are told the law of the Kingdom demands we should love others better than ourselves. Now the way to heaven is difficult enough at the best without men making it still more difficult by raising artificial obstructions in the path. Christ's love for others never lost Him His self-respect. He never renounced His just claims and rights. He died the death rather than renounce them. As disciples of Him, we are not to seek to outstrip Him in the path of loving service, but humbly follow in His steps. Of this we may be quite sure, that our own perfection is the great requirement, and that our perfection and the just claims of others upon us can, and must, be harmonised. Individualism and Altruism are not antagonistic.

Enough, perhaps, has been said to indicate how great has been the reaction from the Individualism which, generally speaking, marked even the most vigorous forms of Christian life early in the century. The doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood that has got such a grip of the thought of our time, has had the larger share in contributing to this reaction; for that doctrine cannot be a real, living belief without the altruistic bearings and tendencies of the belief soon revealing themselves in a practical way. When a man has found God his Father, it is not long before he looks round to find his brother. But next to the truth of the Divine Fatherhood, the idea of His Immanence, of His presence as the power which

> "Lives through all life, extends through all extent,
> Spreads undivided, operates unspent,"

has great and growing influence. It may be difficult for us to conceive how an idea now so familiar and fruitful to us could ever have been otherwise, especially in days so little removed from our own. But even a slight acquaintance with the philosophical and theological literature of the beginning of the century will show us that the God alike of the Deists and of the advocates and apologists of Christianity was external, or, to use the more technical term, transcendent. In the pre-evolution days, the universe was regarded more in the light of a construction than of a living, growing thing. It was not so much an organism as a machine that had been put together with great skill, and a fine adaptation of means to ends, by the great Artificer, who was conceived as standing outside, or transcending, the mechanism whose movements He watched and superintended. Such is the God of Paley's "Natural Theology" (1802), a book which has been called "an Apology for the existence of a God." Even for Butler, God was "the intelligent author of nature and natural governor of the world." Too much ground was there for Thomas Carlyle making Teufelsdröckh exclaim in his wild way: "Is there no God, then; but at best an absentee God, sitting idle, ever since the first Sabbath, at the outside of His Universe, and *seeing* it go?"

If we can without irreverence say that the truth of the Divine Fatherhood has given us a "bigger" God, so that of the Immanence of God has given us a *nearer* God. The natural theology of Paul, of which the famous sermon on Mar's Hill was an exposition, anticipated the truth which is now so dominant and

familiar: "He giveth to all life and breath, and all things; and He made of one every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth. . . . He is not far from each one of us, for in Him we live and move, and have our being" (Acts xvii. 24-28). And yet it is to philosophy, rather than directly to theology, that we owe our introduction into this larger truth; so that the philosophical movement of the century might have been included amongst the auxiliaries of the Kingdom. As Romanticism and the new feeling for history have brought us back to the historic Christ, so the remarkable triumph of Idealism over Materialism in the latter part of the century has made Paul's teaching concerning the all-embracing, ever-working, the nearer God, true to science, to philosophy, and not least to theology.[1]

There is no saving truth, or even comfort, in the thought of the Divine Immanence taken by itself. For there to be either, depends on the God who *is* immanent, and on our relation to Him. At its best, Immanence has to do with the natural rather than with the moral attributes of God. It relates to the

[1] "The idealism of Coleridge and Carlyle, which was so greatly influenced by German philosophy, was met by the reaction of the empirical philosophy of Mill, and the critical philosophy of Hamilton, connected with which was an agnosticism in various forms. Then there followed an evolutionary philosophy, with more of systematic completeness, and in two forms: first, realistic, with an agnostic basis, represented by Herbert Spencer; second, Idealistic, represented by the Neo-Hegelians, Caird and Green, with whom are connected, finally, the living representatives of speculative theism—such as Flint, Iverach d'Arcy, who find in the Trinitarian conception of the Godhead that highest unity to which both religion and philosophy are ever striving to attain."

locus de Deo rather than to His character. At its lowest, Immanence may but serve to express the thinker's conception of the Absolute; his idea of the principle of unity which pervades the Universe and binds all together. Those who regard force as at the bottom of everything, or who think of the universal substance, or who sum up everything in will, or predicate a universal subject—all these alike may speak of the Divine Immanence. Here everything depends on the interpretation given of the Divine. Immanence may mean much or it may mean little, according to the interpretation of the Divine thus given. It naturally lends itself to a Pantheistic view of the Universe, and may even consist with views which are practically materialistic. All, we repeat, depends on the view we take of the God who is immanent.

It seems necessary to dwell a moment on such considerations as these, if only to explain why some good and well-meaning people have viewed the wide favour with which this thought of the Divine Immanence has been received with suspicion, and even with dismay. They have inveighed against it as though it were but another name for Pantheism. They may, as we have seen, have *some* grounds for their attitude, but they have still more solid ground for welcoming the new truth as a powerful ally of faith. Only let them hold to the Divine Fatherhood as made known in the person of Jesus Christ, and then this truth of the Divine Immanence will bring that Father nearer to them, and they will rejoice at seeing His presence and working everywhere. "Every bush will be aflame with God," and as for the

faces of their friends and neighbours, and even of the strangers, whom aforetime they could pass with indifference, a new light will rest on them—the reflection of the truth that they, too, are the children of the All-Father.

But it is well to emphasise the necessity of holding fast both to the Transcendence and Immanence of God. If the Augustinian theology erred by dwelling almost exclusively on the Transcendence, the Alexandrian theology, now largely in the ascendant, may err in the opposite direction by dwelling almost exclusively on the Divine Immanence. The present drift seems to be towards that extreme. We find a recent illustration of the way the current is setting in the statement of a writer of genius, whom we all honour, "that we can no longer speak of a God *behind* Nature." Dr. Matheson reaches this conclusion by denying, what is so often affirmed, that modern science has extended our view of the Universe. He holds that the ancients saw as wide a space as the moderns, but that the moderns have filled the space. Apparently he has taken up the idea of Leibnitz, who maintained that there was no such thing as empty space. So Dr. Matheson says: "In these modern times we can imagine nothing behind Nature—nothing where the ether is not, nothing where force is not. The solitudes have all been inhabited—so far, at least, as imagination can travel. Therefore, no more can man imagine a solitary God. No more can he picture a Deity outside of the material framework. As long as there were void spaces he could. But now that the void has, to fancy's eye, been filled, there is no vacant

recess for God. Henceforth man must seek Him, not behind Nature, but in Nature." [1] We are simply indicating tendencies, and therefore need not stay to criticise the position here taken up any further than to remark that, if on Leibnitz' principle of the sufficient reason we are bound, on this day, to give up the idea of a God behind Nature as derogating from the Divine perfections, then the same principle must always have obtained. If we *must* think of the room as full now, must we not think of it as having always been full? We seem to be shut up to the idea of the eternity of matter.

A still greater necessity presses on us to insist on the "otherness"—the uniqueness of Christ as the only Son and revealer of the Father, and on the fact of His moral transcendence. We are just now more in danger of identifying Him with, and merging Him in, the race, than of dwelling unduly on His uniqueness and difference. He is like us, and identified with us; but He is also unlike us. He transcends us. If not, what assurance have we that we have a God other than the sum of things?

The nineteenth century has bequeathed a good many difficult and necessary tasks to its successor. Amongst these is the duty of holding fast both to the Transcendence and Immanence of God; to the truth that in Christ He is one with us, yet different from us. We have, further, to preserve what gave strength to Puritanism, and yet to temper its austerity and widen its interests by claiming for Christ and His Kingdom all that is "true and

[1] *The Expositor*, February, 1901.

honourable, just, pure, lovely, and of good report." Lastly, we have to reconcile the claims of Individualism and Altruism—not as though the reconciliation implied any natural antagonism.

CHAPTER VIII

THE KINGDOM AS FIRE

The Revival of Enthusiasm.

In any survey of the religious life of the nineteenth century, account should be taken of the revival of enthusiasm, using the word in its modern sense, of ardour or fervency of spirit, in regard to a person or cause or pursuit. The very last thing that could be said of the prevailing type of religion in the eighteenth century would be that it was characterised by enthusiasm. Dean Church, speaking of the close of that century, so far as related to his own Church, says: "Men were afraid of principles; the one thing they most shrank from was the suspicion of enthusiasm." Even when the first quarter of the new century had been passed, the remark was still appropriate. Dean Church goes on to observe that even the Evangelical party in the Church of England, though he freely admits it had done much for the cause of philanthropy, and had some popular and successful preachers in its ranks, yet presented all the characteristics of an exhausted teaching and a spent enthusiasm. As for the historic "High and Dry" party, no one would think for a moment of associating enthusiasm with it.

The bulk of the clergy of the National Church, the Dean tell us, "took their obligations easily." "The beauty of the English Church in this time was its family life of purity and simplicity; its blot was quiet worldliness.[1] The truth is, the ideal of religion prevalent at this time was that men's faith should be, above all things, a *reasonable* faith, well buttressed by evidence; showing itself in quiet, sedate habits, and in the due observance of the prescribed forms of religion, but never suffering itself to deviate into anything that even approached extravagance. Paul's "Let your moderation be known unto all men" (as their Bibles had it) was an injunction they kept to the letter; his "Be fervent in spirit" they did not keep, or want to keep. The emotional side of the religious life was starved, and so the intellect and will had to do double work. Men were so afraid of *wild-fire* that they would rather do without a fire than run the risk of compromising themselves. It was only amongst the Methodists and those who shared their spirit and believed in a religion of experience, that enthusiasm had its claims frankly recognised. Not that the Methodists were let alone in the enjoyment of their monopoly of enthusiasm. No; its manifestations frequently excited the ire or the mockery of those who had no enthusiasm of their own to manifest. Even bishops and lesser dignitaries of the Church thought it their duty to deliver charges levelled against enthusiasm, and to write books for the purpose of reproving what they regarded as a dangerous and reprehensible thing. If we could conceive such a thing as that no religion of the red-

[1] "The Oxford Movement," pp. 3, 4, 13.

hot, fervent type were tolerated anywhere save in the Salvation Army, where it should be welcomed and allowed full play, but only to be censured and sneered at as "downright fanaticism" by those who glanced that way, we should not be drawing an unfair picture of what obtained in the religious world at the beginning of the century. For, be it observed, this word "fanaticism" much more accurately conveys the meaning that was formerly attached to the word "enthusiasm" than does the latter word in our modern use of it. If we turn to the dictionaries of the time, we shall see that, in accordance with the etymology of the word, enthusiasm is defined as the mistaking our own notions or feelings for the direct impressions of the Spirit of God; the unhealthy fermentations of our mind for Divine inspirations. It is in this sense the word figures in Bishop Gibson's pastoral letter on "Enthusiasm and Lukewarmness" to which Whitefield made reply, and in the parallel drawn out by Bishop Lavington between "The Enthusiasm of the Methodists and Papists." Amongst the "notions" thus discountenanced and set aside as nothing but enthusiasm were such comfortable doctrines as the direct witness of the Spirit to the fact of a man's adoption as the child of God, with the joy springing from the assurance of sins forgiven and the consciousness of acceptance; the sense that the Spirit abides and works in the believer as his sanctifier; the persuasion that extraordinary answers to prayer are from time to time vouchsafed, and that the child of God may be "moved" to do this or to refrain from doing that by the touch of his promised heavenly guide; that special assistance may be looked for in

making the preached Word effectual in the enlightening and saving of men—all these facts of the inner life covered by the one word "experience," and so familiar in this our day, were written over and written off by the cancelling word—Enthusiasm!

In England this tepid type of religion, formerly in vogue, had no particular name; but in Scotland, where it had a long reign, it was known as "Moderatism." It has been variously, and in each case rightly, defined as "that spirit which exalted common sense and balance of faculty above emotional and introspective religion"; as "rationalism with the chill off"; as the "tenets and spirit of the party which claimed the character of moderation in doctrine, discipline, and government." The Moderates of the eighteenth century had some eminent men amongst them, who even yet are more than names. Such were Robertson the historian, "Jupiter" Carlyle, Adam Ferguson, and Hugh Blair, the writer of sermons once universally read and admired, and author of the "Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres" that some of us read in early youth to our profiting. Blair has been described as "a man of his age to the very core. There is something very admirable in the singleness and completeness with which he represented his century."[1] And we may add there is something very appropriate in the fact that this typical litterateur of the eighteenth century should have departed with the century he typified, dying December 27, 1800. These, and other eminent Moderates that could be named, were not only men of learning and

[1] "A Famous Litterateur of the Eighteenth Century," in "Cross Lights," 1888.

culture, but some of them, at least, were men of warm and generous natures, possessing strong social qualities; but somehow, when they have to do with religion, they seem to enter another region. A rapid lowering of temperature takes place, and we feel as though we had got into the frigid zone. It was the spirit of Moderatism, quite as much as the narrowing effects of the Calvinistic creed which led the memorable Assembly of 1796 to reject by a majority of 14, in a House of 102, overtures pleading for a favourable consideration of the claims of foreign missions. "Jupiter" Carlyle was present at the Assembly, and we are told he was shocked by the proposal made. "For half a century," said he, "had he sat as a member, and he was happy to think that never till now had he heard such revolutionary principles averred on the floor of the House!"[1] The mover of the rejection of the overtures contended that it was improper and absurd to propagate the Gospel abroad while there remained a single individual at home without the means of religious knowledge,[2] and the majority agreed with him. It must surely have been one of this majority who, according to the strange story told by Dr. Guthrie, made his annual endeavour to mission his parish, which embraced a population as degraded as Guthrie's own. "Once a year he approached the mouth of each several 'close' in his district—down whose dark vista of sin and misery, however, he never penetrated —and there, uncovering his head with due solemnity,

[1] "Hugh Miller," by W. Keith Leask, p. 87.

[2] C. C. M'Crie, D.D., "The Free Church of Scotland: her Ancestry, her Claims, and her Conflict.'

and lifting his gloved right hand, he besought the Divine blessing to rest on 'all the inhabitants, young and old, of this close.' The annual 'visitation' thus ended, he went on his way." [1] It was not until 1824 that this anti-missionary policy was reversed by the Assembly's appointing a Committee to prepare a scheme for foreign missions.

We deplore—and rightly deplore—the religious indifference of our times; but those who dig and delve in the literature of an earlier generation will find reason to conclude that there was much stronger ground for alarm seventy or eighty years ago on this account than now. It was in 1828 that Lamennais made a desperate effort to arouse his countrymen from their lethargy by the publication of the first volume of his "Essai sur l'indifference en Matiére de Religion." Religious indifference he defined as the extinction of all feeling of love or hatred in the heart, through the absence of any judgment or belief in the mind. To Lamennais the most ominous symptom of the times was that men concerned themselves so little about religion as not even to take the trouble to hate it. He would have welcomed opposition as at least evincing the conviction that religion was of some account, and must be reckoned with. Says he:

"The century which is most hopelessly diseased is not that which is passionate in error, but rather that which neglects, which disdains truth. There is still vitality, and consequently hope, where violence is seen; but when all movement has ceased, when the pulse no longer beats, when the heart has become

[1] "Life of Dr. Guthrie," vol. i., p. 369.

cold, can we fail to recognise the signs of approaching dissolution?"

Sainte-Beuve, the celebrated French critic, in his essay on Lamennais, written in 1832, confirms this judgment on the religious indifference which was so marked a feature of the contemporary life of France. He endorses the remark of Lamennais that "nothing is more quickly used than will-power," and he is disposed to believe that France put forth such prodigious efforts of will-power in the French Revolution that she has not been able to recover herself since, or make good the expenditure. "The intelligence of the age is enlarged, its science is grown; it has studied, learnt, comprehended many things, and in many fashions; but it has no more dared, nor been able, nor wished to *will*. Among the men who consecrate themselves to the works of thought, and whose are the domain of moral and philosophical sciences, nothing is more difficult to meet with to-day than a will in the breast of an intelligence, a conviction, a *faith*." [1]

Such was the state of things in France which Lamennais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and the rest of the Liberal Catholics set themselves to improve; but with such disappointing results. In England the situation presented similar features, and a similar lamentation was raised. In 1830, Hugh James Rose was Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge. Rose has been pronounced by Dean Church to have been "the most eminent person of his generation as a divine"; and it was to him that Newman dedicated the fourth volume of his Parochial Sermons with the words: "Who, when hearts were

[1] "Critiques et Portraits Litteraires," tome ii., p. 283.

failing, bade us stir up the gift that was in us, and betake ourselves to our true mother." In harmony with statutory requirements, Rose had, as Christian Advocate, to send forth a publication each year during his tenure of office. His "Brief Remarks on the Dispositions towards Christianity generated by Prevailing Opinions and Pursuits" appeared in 1830, in fulfilment of the required conditions. In this valuable pamphlet Rose diagnosed the maladies of the age, and in almost the same words as the Frenchmen he dwells on the fact that so considerable a section of society were, in relation to religion, "neither cold nor hot." They had endless curiosity to know, but their knowledge was not accompanied by any deep emotion, nor did they seem to have the moral energy to come to a conclusion, much less to act. What are these but signs of an indifference to religion of the worst and most dangerous kind? Moderatism was bad enough, but this is worse by far; for not only are the emotions unstirred in the presence of religious verities, but the will has lost its energy, and only the intellect remains to cast a careless glance at those things which the angels earnestly desire to look into.

Now the Oxford Movement, which has had great issues, certainly did much to bring enthusiasm back again into the daily religious life of men. We know it may be said—and it is said—that the Promethian fire was borrowed not for the highest purpose, in that it was to be used against Liberalism, which, in those days when Irish bishoprics had been abolished, and English prelates had been warned to set their houses in order, was the foe chiefly to be dreaded. We know,

too, that in the plan of campaign against this militant Liberalism, the method finally adopted proceeded on the false assumption that there is a radical schism in man's nature; that the intellect is to be dreaded, and must be broken in and rigorously kept in a subordinate place, and that it must be made to do the Gibeonitish work of fetching and carrying, and finding reasons for Faith's assumptions. All this is true, and hence Anglo-Catholicism has to bear the reproach which attaches to its birth, and suffer the bar-sinister to be blazoned on that escutcheon which now gleams high throughout the land. In order to rehabilitate the Church, the authority of the past was to be invoked against the Liberalism which ever kept on advancing, and growing more and more exacting in its demands. On this point Dr. Fairbairn's words are strong—a little too strong, we cannot but think: "It was out of this appeal to a tried and vanquished past against a living present that the Anglo-Catholic movement was born. It was less the child of a great love than of a great hate—hatred of what its spokesman and founder called 'Liberalism.'"[1] We know that the Liberalism it was thus sought to oppose was really no foe of the Kingdom of God. It was what our fathers believed in and struggled to advance, and it was what the Church should have loved, and not hated. It should have met the oncoming movement of Liberalism with a discriminating love that would have sought to guide its course and check its extravagances. Still, instead of saying that Anglo-Catholicism was the "child of a great hate," we would prefer to say it was the child of a great love

[1] "Catholicism: Roman and Anglican," p. 84.

for the old Mother Church; but that hatred of Liberalism was the midwife that helped it to the birth and rocked its cradle.

However, thus much having been said, we return to the point we specially wish to make, viz., that with the introduction of Anglo-Catholicism, the old lethargy, as the characteristic of the religious life of the State Church, went—and it was a blessed riddance. The direct and the indirect results upon the other churches were all for good. Enthusiasm came to her own again. In the letters and memoirs of the time you feel that a new spirit is abroad. Aspiration for a "cause" works in the minds of men, and their brain sets itself new tasks, and the busy fingers wield the pen, and willing feet move hither and thither to scatter the literature which it is fondly hoped will be the harbinger of a new era. "Be up and doing!" is the cry that resounds on every side. All is stir and bustle. The very word for the new spirit and endeavour is—"the movement."

We have no intention of tracing the cause of the movement, which may be said to have had three stages. The first stage we call, appropriately enough, the Oxford Movement; for, not forgetting the important preliminary meeting at Hadleigh Rectory, Oxford was the *fons et origo* of Anglo-Catholicism. Then came Ritualism, which, though at first sight it may scarcely seem to be logically sequent to the aims of the Oxford group—Newman, Keble, Pusey—yet really marked a further advance in a similar direction, being intended to popularise High Church doctrines and principles. The third stage is reached when Anglicanism, instead of being content to be a

mere party or school in the Church, aspires to dominance—ever gaining at the expense of the Low and Broad Church parties, and not disdaining to borrow from them when it can do so without prejudice to its own exclusive aims. The end steadily kept in view is now in sight, and the day seems not far distant when the National Church will be captured by the sacerdotalists, and Anglo-Catholicism will be able to say, "The Church, it is I."

Anglicanism has not reached its present position in the land as the result of a mere drift. There has been steadfast purpose. Its apostles and minor workers have shown boundless zeal and devotion for the cause they have had at heart. That cause, too, has had its "martyrs," who have defied both persecution and prosecution, and braved imprisonment. Whatever fault we may have to find with the dominant party in the State Church, it cannot justly be censured for giving the cold shoulder to enthusiasm. The typical curate of the modern story is a great contrast to the clergy who figure, say, in Jane Austen's novels, and, one might add, he is a great improvement on those gentry. The latter might be good and estimable men in their way, but it was in a rather poor way, and to call them enthusiasts would simply be to miscall them. Contrast with these the appearances of the ascetic Newcome in Mrs. Humphry Ward's "Robert Elsmere." Whatever impression the authoress may have meant to leave with regard to Newcome, and the class of which he may be supposed to be the type, we rather suspect the many will find themselves more in sympathy with Newcome than with the hero of the book.

The Ennobling of Enthusiasm.

But we now come to notice the gradual purifying and ennobling of this rekindled enthusiasm. Now the quality of our enthusiasm depends on that which inspires it; and when we speak of the enthusiasm of a thing, we imply that the source and the object of the enthusiasm are the same. The enthusiast lavishes the wealth of his love and admiration on the object which has inspired them, in much the same way as the clouds give back the moisture they took up by evaporation from the earth. Now it is generally admitted that the Church, in the course of her long history, has passed through three successive stages. First, It was a holy society composed of those who were united by a common fervent attachment to Christ their Lord. Second, It was an association of those who were agreed as to what it was incumbent on them to believe. Then, again it was the communion of those who entered a Church, constituted after a certain definite pattern, and who willingly submitted themselves to its polity and ordinances. Now it is clear that each of these principles, which, as we see from history, have served to determine what should constitute a Church, and be the bond of union amongst its members, making the many one, is capable of generating its own special enthusiasm. A person, a creed, a polity—each possesses this generating power, and the first possesses it most of all. It is inevitable it should be so; history shows that such has been the case, and it is recognised that such enthusiasm is rightly due from those enjoying the privileges of Church membership.

Take the case of a Church with its special history, its particular constitution and distinctive polity. We recognise that such a Church, be it the Church of our birth, or of our later deliberate choice, ought to be more to us than any other Church can be; that it should be the inspirer and object of our affections, and that it has just claims upon our service, and may even demand we should make sacrifices on its behalf. Do we not complain sometimes of the absence or dying down of the "connexional spirit," as though it were a furnace-fire that must be kept up on pain of the slackening or stoppage of the machinery of the Church? To feed and fan that fire is therefore deemed an imperative and praiseworthy duty; and none of us can fairly object to become either stokers or to be "stoked." We all know what is meant when we speak of a "loyal Churchman," "a good Primitive," and these phrases carry with them no hint of disparagement, but the reverse.

A good example of the ardent affection which "Mother Church" can inspire in her sons is afforded by the lines of good George Herbert on "The British Church":

> "I joy, dear mother, when I view
> Thy perfect lineaments and hue,
> Both sweet and bright.
> Beauty in thee takes up her place,
> And dates her letters from thy face,
> When she doth write.
>
> "A fine aspect in fit array,
> Neither too mean nor yet too gay,
> Shows who is best."

So far, we can quite understand and sympathise with

George Herbert's enthusiasm for his own Church. Nor do we find fault with him when he goes on to declare his decided preference for his own "mother" before other people's mothers.

> "Outlandish looks may not compare ;
> For all they either painted are,
> Or else undrest."

It is Rome, she on the hills, the overdressed one with painted cheeks and wanton looks, he glances at ; and then he casts his eye on the Puritan :

> "She in the valley is so shy
> Of dressing, that her hair doth lie
> About her ears ;
> While she avoids her neighbour's pride,
> She wholly goes on the other side,
> And nothing wears."

It is quite natural that the Anglican should think his own Church the best ; but "she in the valley" also thinks she has something to be proud of, and that may well serve to kindle her enthusiasm. She may be but poorly "put on"; by comparison with the stylishly-dressed ladies of Rome or Canterbury she may even be said to be "undrest." But she is free ; and what she has, however humble it may be, is her own.

It may, then, be taken as proved that a Church is capable of kindling the fire of enthusiasm in its votaries, and the ecclesiastical history of the nineteenth century shows us this fire at work. Nor has the century been wanting in evidence to prove that in the creeds and standards of a Church there resides the power of evoking an enthusiasm which will burn as a fire. But, after all, the highest enthusiasm is that which is inspired by a Person—

and *the* Person ; and when we speak of the Kingdom as Fire, it is of this we would speak.

Christ never directly compared His Kingdom to fire ; but John the Baptist spoke of Him as He who should baptize "with the Holy Ghost and with fire," and Christ Himself averred that He came "to bring fire on the earth." Now, fire has various properties. It can purge the dross from the metal ; it can consume, so that a favourite phrase for it is "the devouring element." In its more subtle form of the electric flash, it can blast and rive the solid oak. But the fire can fuse and unite, as well as consume or refine. When branches of various trees are lying together, they preserve their differences so long as the fire is absent. But when the fire has been kindled and envelops them, it soon overcomes their differences. You can no longer tell which is a stick of ash, or oak, or elm. The fire has subdued all unto itself, until, in the glow, nothing is discernible but fire. So is it with the enthusiasm which a personal attachment shared by many inspires ; it is the most unifying thing imaginable. When the people of a great city come out in their thousands to line the streets in order to do honour to some victorious general or national hero, one impulse thrills them as he passes, one sentiment animates their features or rings out in their huzzas. They are twice ten thousand in number, each with his differences beyond the power of arithmetic to compute ; but they are *one*, reduced —nay, elevated—to oneness by their enthusiasm, which is one. I know not how better to approach and illustrate the thought that the highest, most unifying power—a power which sets at naught and

overleaps all other differences—is the enthusiasm of Christ; and, if I mistake not, it is because the Churches are coming more and more under the spell of this enthusiasm that in these latter days there has been such a coming together that at times it were difficult to say who are Methodists, or who are Baptists, or who are Presbyterians. Enthusiasm has got back to Christ, to find in Him, rather than in polity or in creed, her chief inspiration. As the Church began by making loyalty and love to Christ the chief bond of union, so the century has ended by a distinctive approximation to that ideal, when, under the influence of the Spirit of Fire, the disciples were of "one heart and soul."

Fission and Fusion.

In the first half of the century fission was the order of the day; in the latter half, fission has given place to something much more like fusion; and it is the intensest of all fire which has brought it about.

The old story tells us how a good minister of the Kirk in the forties prayed: "Lord, baptize us with the spirit of disruption." Assuredly, in his case, the promise had its fulfilment—"Before they call, I will answer." The spirit he prayed for he already had, or he would not have put up such a prayer. That "spirit of disruption" was widely diffused and active through the former half of the century; nor need we here decry it, much less strive to rekindle the embers of controversies that have long since gone black out. No doubt men contended for what they deemed the

right constitution and ordering of the Church; and though, in regard to credal controversies, we may, after this lapse of time, think some of the contestants to have been grievously mistaken, yet we must still do them the justice to believe that they contended for what they regarded as the truth of God and the Scriptures. Controversy in religion, though no more desirable than is war, yet may sometimes be just and necessary, and from it lasting good may come. To regard it as "set on fire of hell" would be to make a serious mistake. The merest chronological mention of the controversies, which in the first fifty years of the century agitated the Churches, and which, in some cases, led to disruption and the formation of independent communities, must here suffice. The Baptists had their hyper-Calvinistic controversy, the controversy as to open and restricted communion, and the Serampore controversy. But these did not shatter unity, and may be regarded as having been "of the nature of so many family discussions." We have to note the losses sustained by the Mother Church of Methodism in the formation of: The New Connexion (1797), the Independent Methodists (1810), the Bible Christians (1815), the Primitive Wesleyans in Ireland (1816), the Wesleyan Association (1836), The Wesleyan Reform Association (1849). In this enumeration we have not included the formation of the Primitive Methodist Church, for the very good reason that it was not the result of a "split," but rather an independent growth. The "spirit of disruption" may be regarded as having had its greatest, though not quite its last, manifestation in the century, when, in 1843, four

hundred and seventy-four ministers of the Established Church of Scotland signed the deed of demission, and constituted themselves the Free Church of Scotland.

The Rev. Charles A. Whittick, in his "The Church of England and Recent Religious Thought"— a book written in a very fair spirit, and showing much acuteness, notes the fact that this tendency to disruption or fission ("disintegration" is the word he uses) ceased soon after the middle of the century, and he attributes this fact to the feeling of uneasiness and apprehension excited in the Churches by the gradual spread of the Germanising theology in this country. By this time the old denominational boundaries had become of less importance than the two divergent schools of opinion found in each denomination—the orthodox and the new or more liberal school. The mutual suspicion of these two schools kept things in a kind of unstable equilibrium. What amount of truth there may be in this explanation we shall not stay to inquire; but we are of opinion that after the close of what may be called the "fission period," at a point somewhere in the sixties, began the most trying period of the century, to the Free Churches especially. It was the period when Agnosticism was fashionable, and young society ladies and Oxford graduates were morbidly anxious to tell you that they had lost their faith; when scientists seriously proposed that an investigation should be made into the alleged efficacy of prayer; when Professor Tyndall told the British Association at Belfast that he could discern in matter "the promise and the potency of all terrestrial life"; when

æstheticism, represented by its prophet, Oscar Wilde, and realism and symbolism, and all other such "isms," that had no ground in eternal realities, but were born of partial views and a perverted will, had their day; and, we should perhaps, go on to add, when the spirit of negation even invaded the pulpit, and there was some room for the reproach: "Coolness of intellectual survey seems now the Methodist ideal; formerly it was fire." Thank God, it is now some years since we emerged from this reactionary period. We are in closer touch with reality, and there is the ringing accent of conviction in the preaching of the men whom the people love to hear.

We are told that human progress is not made in a straight line, but that a spiral or, still better, a zigzag, would more fittingly represent its mode of progression. If this be true, as there is good reason to believe it is, then, in the period referred to, the downward stroke of the zigzag took a longer and deeper dip than usual. We have called it a period of reaction—and such it undoubtedly was—and if its causes are sought, they will be found in the Agnostic and Materialistic science and philosophy prevalent at the time. We find a confirmation of these views in a brilliant letter written in a secular journal in 1895, by one signing himself "An Unknown Quantity," who points with satisfaction to what he regards as the indubitable signs of our emergence as a nation from a somewhat long period of reaction. Some of the unknown author's sentences are worth putting on record, for they are marked by acuteness, and the passage of time only renders them more valuable:

"I do not want to overstate the case, but I think it

will be generally allowed that the barriers of religion were at that time much weakened and broken down. What followed? Not the outbreak of crime that some expected, for the recruits of Agnosticism were not from the criminal classes. Not the rigid life by rule of reason that others had foretold—for the two primary instincts go for something. A spirit of restlessness followed, a spirit of inquiry, a hatred of fixed forms and traditional ideas. One thing after another was tried; nothing was too new, too wild, too extravagant. Reverence decreased. In the birthplace of this spirit of unrest, something was done to keep reverence, and Positivists worshipped nothing in particular in a little place off Fetter Lane. But in spite of such efforts, the general feeling of reverence did decrease. For the slavish feeling of fear, that also decreased, neither orthodox nor unorthodox are likely to feel any regret. The extravagance and levity which have been so noticeable among us may be traced, perhaps, in part to this weakening of the barriers of religion. . . . But extravagance and levity, a restless and morbid spirit—all that was implied by that tawdry, borrowed, used-out detestable word *fin-de-siècle*—these things have brought us to the point of departure for revolution."[1]

During this period some of the Nonconformist Churches had their doctrinal controversies. To the student of Ecclesiastical History these may be interesting, but we shall not dwell on them here at any length; for somehow controversies, when looked at down the vista of years, seem as strange as the movements of *al fresco* dancers when you cannot hear

[1] *London Daily Chronicle*, August 6, 1895.

the music. But, as Carlyle would say, Dryasdust has preserved a note on one of those controversies which has its points of interest.

"The Battle of the Negative Theology started with the publication of 'The Rivulet,' by Thomas Lynch, author of 'Dismiss me not Thy service, Lord.' It was reviewed by James Grant in the *Morning Advertiser*. Somebody may perhaps remember that Grant wrote a book called 'Heaven our Home,' and it is even possible that some one survives who has read the book. Grant said that there was not in "The Rivulet," from beginning to end, one particle of vital religion or evangelical doctrine. *The Eclectic Review* defended 'The Rivulet.' Grant returned to the combat; reviewed the review. The agitation grew: fifteen leading ministers, including the leonine Thomas Binney, protested against Grant's attacks. Grant reprinted and commented on the protest, and he quoted some of the hymns, and asked certain of the protesters to say whether they could announce such hymns to their congregations to be sung by them! Then the redoubtable Dr. Campbell, of the *British Banner*, appeared on the scene. His entrance into the fray had long been expected and desired by the attacking party. The Doctor pronounced that 'nothing like it had occurred within the memory of the present generation, or perhaps since the days of the Reformation.' He said 'The Rivulet,' considered as a whole, was, in his judgment, the most unspiritual publication of the kind in the English language! Campbell wrote seven letters (afterwards printed in separate form), addressed 'To the Principals and Professors of the Independent and Baptist Colleges of England,'

and the controversy grew until it became a question of the existence among the ministers and in the colleges of the Negative Theology. Such was the 'great Rivulet controversy.'"

After reading Dryasdust's note, and then casting a glance at the little book which was the occasion of all this excitement, occupying its accustomed niche on our shelves, we cannot but be reminded of the words, "Behold how much wood is kindled by how small a fire!" As for "The Rivulet," looked at in the light of to-day, it seems harmless enough. More than that, it possesses positive qualities which make it a helpful companion to the devout life. When James Grant pronounced that there was not, "from beginning to end, one particle of vital religion or evangelical doctrine in it," it was well he added the words, "At least, if there be, we have not been able to discover it." This saving clause explains much, and reminds one of the little boy Thomas Lynch humorously referred to, who, on being told by his mamma that there was an egg in the pudding, was sorely puzzled because he could not find it. "Now," adds Lynch, and he might have been thinking of Grant when he wrote the words, "there are many grown men and women (not *Christianly* full-grown men and women) who, unless they see the very form of a doctrine, will not believe they can have the nutriment of it. They ask, 'Where's the egg?' and if you say, 'It is mixed with it; why, the doctrine of atonement (or of justification by faith, or of sanctification by the Spirit, as the case may be) was diffused through the whole of what was said,' they shake their heads suspiciously. They will have nothing to

do with such preaching, or such books, or such people."[1]

But what began with "The Rivulet" broadened and deepened, until in 1857 the "Davidson Controversy" was reached. This led, first of all, to the regretted retirement of the devout and scholarly Dr. Vaughan from the Principalship of the Lancashire Independent College, and then to the resignation of Dr. Davidson, who had been charged with holding and promulgating the views of the German Neologists. Then in 1877, at the Autumnal Meeting of the Congregational Union, there took place the famous Informal Conference, at which the Revs. Mark Wilks and J. Allanson Picton pleaded that men of advanced views like themselves should be allowed to participate in the privileges of communion, on the ground that religious communion "is not dependent on agreement in theological, critical, or historical opinion." This led to the Committee of the Union submitting for acceptance by the Assembly in May, 1878, a declaration of faith, "reasserting in brief the principles on which the Union had been originally established, and affirming its adhesion to certain great articles of the Christian Faith."[2] Ten years after the Leicester Conference came the "Down Grade Controversy," which agitated the Baptist Churches. Mr. Spurgeon resigned his membership of the Baptist Union, and declined to withdraw his resignation. The battle went on for a year and a half, and then the Baptist Union was split by the secession of some four hundred members, consequent upon the refusal

[1] Lynch, "Letters to the Scattered, and other Papers," p. 16.
[2] "Life of Dr. R. W. Dale," p. 342.

of the Union to adopt a declaration of orthodoxy that would satisfy the conservatives.

We gladly turn from these controversies of the past with the words of Wesley in our minds, "O King, live for ever, and let controversy die." A brighter page awaits us.

In Mr. Whittick's book, already referred to, we meet with the following passage: "It is a common remark that Nonconformists are as much separated from each other as they are from the Church, and this remark, though, like others of its kind, somewhat too highly coloured, must yet, on the whole, be pronounced true. At any rate, the various denominations of Dissent are not making up their differences internally, or in relation to each other, though they are not adding to them."[1]

These words were written out of adequate knowledge, and in all good faith, *as recently as* 1893; and yet how utterly wide of the mark they appear as the summing up of the present ecclesiastical situation, so far as it relates to the Free Churches of the land. Truly much has happened since 1893, and Mr. Whittick's words reveal in a way almost startling the notable advance towards Christian unity that has been made by the various Noncomformist Churches during the last decade. Recent events are too fresh in our recollection to need more than the merest reference. We still stand within the circle of their influence, and the glow they cast is still on our cheek, and its warmth felt at the heart. The formation of the Evangelical Free Church Federation was an

[1] "The Church of England and Recent Religious Thought," pp. 90, 91.

epoch-making event, for it has shown the Churches, once so shy and distrustful of each other, how much they have in common. It has revealed to them their strength in combination, and it has mobilised them as one great army for Christian service. Intercourse between the Churches is showing how much there is in each that is worthy of respect and imitation. Their differences are seen to be superficial, their agreement fundamental. In the recent coming together of the Congregationalists and Baptists, there seems the prophecy that fraternisation may, in the not distant future, end in amalgamation. The union of the United Presbyterian Church and the Free Kirk of Scotland was ecclesiastically an event of prime significance and importance, and fittingly crowned the century. One regret only we have to express, viz., that the long-protracted negotiations for union between the Primitive Methodists and Bible Christian Churches came to nothing, and less than nothing; and that, in consequence, we have been deprived of the honour of leading the van towards that most desirable end—the federation, or even fusion, of the various Methodist Churches.

Whither are we tending ecclesiastically? What shall the end of these things be? It may safely be predicted that very few, if any, new sects will be formed in the near future, and that even the number of those now existing will be lessened. Fission has ceased, and fusion will take its place. From federation we may pass to union, and some imaginative souls even forecast the time when the most conspicuous objects in the ecclesiastical firmament will be the Monopolist Church, and the great Evangelical Free

Church—these dividing, as it were, the vault of heaven in these latitudes between them.

Men variously describe, and give various names to, the new feeling and tendency which is so manifestly at work. Some say the centripetal force is at last taking the place of the centrifugal one. This is to speak learnedly, though scarcely illuminatively, though the ideas made use of are borrowed from the heavenly bodies. Others, with Mr. Whittick would say: "The disintegrating process, so active in the first part of the century, now, since my book was written, shows signs of giving place to a process of integration." This, too, though true enough, does not help us much; for we want to know *why* the one process has taken the place of its opposite. It is idle, too, for men to think they fully explain how it is that the Churches are "making up their differences" and coming together, by saying: "Oh, it is just the result of the same tendency we see at work elsewhere. In the commercial world we have big 'combines,' and gigantic trusts, and liability companies; and we see the same tendency at work on even a larger scale, moving those who belong to a common stock, and who speak a common tongue, to draw together, and attain the consciousness of natural unity." We would prefer to say that the fire Christ came to bring is amongst us, and is doing its work. This, we contend, is the simplest and most satisfactory explanation of the changed relations of the Churches to each other, and the new spirit that has taken possession of them. If the "idea of the Kingdom is that which unites," then must we conclude that the Kingdom of God is coming with power.

The spirit of unity naturally tends to union. Fire works to fusion. We know that Churches in their selfish isolation may still go on talking of the spirit of unity which pervades and knits together the universal Church of Christ. They have been talking like this all through the century, even when controversies were most rife and bitter. They have never ceased to sing

> "One family we dwell in Him,
> One Church, above, beneath."

But what then? A spirit of unity which never unites, and makes no effort in the direction of union, is as much an abstraction as was that substance "without any qualities" which the metaphysicians feigned to exist. Such a quiddity *may* exist, but we shall more readily believe in its existence when it comes within our ken, and begins to obey the very law of its being, which is to tend towards its like and seek to blend therewith.

CHAPTER IX

OF SUCH IS THE KINGDOM

WE venture to say these words have been oftener quoted and preached from during the last quarter of a century than they were during the first three quarters of the nineteenth century put together; nor is the reason for this far to seek.

Historically, the Sunday School may have had its origin in the philanthropic labours of Robert Raikes from 1780 onwards, and thus the institution belongs to the eighteenth century so far as its inception is concerned. But not only has the institution had a marvellous extension, and been greatly systematised and perfected during the nineteenth century, but—what is even of greater importance—a new conception of the child's relation to Christ and the Church has arisen, and has made its way—at first slowly, and then with greater rapidity—until it is becoming plain that the history of this one simple conception that the child belongs to Christ, and therefore to His Church, affords one of the most striking exemplifications of the parable of the mustard-seed and its growth that we can well think of.

For a long time the Church scarcely seemed to know how to regard children, or what to do with

them! As Mahomet's coffin was fabled to be suspended between heaven and earth, so the children were metaphorically relegated to a vague, unsubstantial No-man's Land. They were treated as though they neither belonged, properly and fully, either to Christ or the devil; to the Church or the world. Some of us are old enough to remember when Horace Bushnell's "Christian Nurture" first found its way to this country; how it was read and pondered by some of the leaders in our Churches, whose thinkings on the subject of child-religion it completely revolutionised; and yet these thinkings simply resolved themselves at last into this: "Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven." And so these words became the theme of much of their converse, and became the text of many a sermon. In their own homes, too, they recognised the Kingdom in their children, and being logical and very practical, they proceeded to enroll them as members of the Church, although the fourteenth milestone on their child's life-path, to which the law-book made special reference, was many miles in advance, and, as yet, quite out of sight.

What has been going on during the century in regard to the children of the Kingdom, reminds one of the sweetly simple poem of Julia Gill, entitled "Christ and the Little Ones":

"'The Master has come over Jordan,'
Said Hannah the mother one day,
'He is healing the people who throng Him
With a touch of His finger, they say.

"'And now I shall carry the children,
Little Rachel and Samuel and John;
I shall carry the baby Esther
For the Lord to look upon.'

"The father looked at her kindly,
But he shook his head and smiled;
'Now who but a doating mother
Would think of a thing so wild?'"

These are not all the verses of the poem, but those given answer our purpose; for, of course, Hannah got her way, and the children—not excluding the infant—were taken to Jesus, who received and blessed them. All this may be regarded as a parable of the century, and simply means that the mother-heart of the Church has been aroused, and has come to the resolve to carry the children "for the Lord to look upon"; and the resolve has been carried out, despite the demurs and expressed fears of over-cautious and too diffident souls.

The Christian Endeavour Movement, which has had such a rapid and world-wide expansion, is but the logical sequel and complement of the conception which is at the basis of Sunday School work, viz., the child that belongs to Christ can do something *for* Christ, and should be encouraged and expected to try. As the child is *of* the Kingdom, let him endeavour *for* the Kingdom.

CHAPTER X

THE REVIVAL OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM IN ENGLAND

EVERYONE is familiar with Macaulay's New Zealander, who is pictured as taking his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's. But we suspect that many overlook the connection in which the traveller from the Antipodes is introduced. When London shall be a vast solitude, and its ruins objects of curiosity to the occasional visitor from the mighty empires of the South, Roman Catholicism "may still exist in undiminished vigour."

Macaulay's brilliant essay on "Ranke's History of the Popes," in which the New Zealander figures, remains to attest at once his limitations and his far-sightedness; his limitations, because in it he strenuously maintains that neither natural nor revealed religion is truly progressive; his far-sightedness because, at a time when it was almost universally believed that the spread of enlightenment must necessarily be fatal to the pretensions of the Romish Church, Macaulay boldly challenges that belief. He shows that there is nothing in human nature or in history to lend countenance to such a view; that if such a man as Sir Thomas More could bring himself

to believe in Transubstantiation, then any man of parts and learning may do the same. Macaulay goes on to show at length that four times since the establishment of the Papacy has she had to fight for existence; that twice she came out of the struggle victorious, and though in the conflict of the Reformation and the Revolution she sustained grievous wounds, she yet came out of those conflicts with "the principle of life still strong within her." He notices, too, what seemed also to Coleridge a most remarkable fact, that "no Christian nation which did not adopt the principles of the Reformation before the end of the sixteenth century has ever adopted them. Catholic countries have, since that time, become infidel, and become Catholic again; but none have become Protestant."[1]

A few years ago—almost, indeed, at the end of the century—this historical generalisation could not well have been questioned. But the unexpected often happens in the Kingdom of God, as well as in the kingdoms of the world, and these unexpected happenings make sad work of our generalisations. France is "the eldest daughter of the Church," but the movement, thoroughly Protestant in spirit, whatever it may be in name, now going on in France, is reaching such proportions as to excite the ardent hope that a new Reformation has already begun in that fair land. What is most significant and hopeful about this movement is that it is in the ranks of the

[1] "It is a profound question to answer, why it is that, since the middle of the sixteenth century, the Reformation had not advanced one step in Europe."—"Specimens of the Table Talk of Samuel Taylor Coleridge," p. 105.

priesthood where its influence is most powerfully felt. Yet more striking in certain respects, and still more decidedly Protestant, is the "Out of Rome" movement which has so recently developed in Austria. It may perhaps be wise not to allow ourselves to be too sanguine as to the probable issues of these two movements; for we have the somewhat disappointing history of the Old Catholic Church to admonish us not to expect too much; yet there does seem real ground to hope that Macaulay's generalisation is not destined to hold good much longer, and that what Rome loses, Protestantism, and not infidelity, may gain.

But we are anticipating. We take Roman Catholicism to be the most perfect and consistent embodiment of the Church idea—of the pseudo-Catholicism of man as opposed to the Catholicity of Christ. In view of our purpose, therefore, Anglicanism may largely be disregarded; for, in so far as it is sacerdotal, and therefore exclusive, in its pretensions, it logically belongs to Rome; and what is true of Rome remains true for Anglicanism. Since Newman's time the *via media* has been broken up, "the half-way house" rendered logically untenantable.

We have assumed already that the Church-idea has made notable advance during this century—in England, at least; and it becomes an interesting question whether the Church which embodies that idea in its most perfect form has indeed, as the title of our chapter would indicate, experienced a revival. If we limit our view to the nineteenth century, as compared with the preceding one, there can be little doubt that a revival of Catholicism has taken place. Macaulay, writing in 1840, recognised that it was

already in progress, and that a reaction in favour of Roman Catholicism had set in, even before the burial rites had been solemnised over the remains of Pius VII., who died a captive in France in 1799. That was the nadir of Roman Catholicism. If, without limiting our attention to any particular country, we inquire, How does Roman Catholicism stand generally at the end of the century, as compared with its beginning? the testimony of Harnack on this point may fittingly be adduced: "No one who looks at the present political situation can have any ground for asserting that the power of the Romish Church is on the wane. What a growth it has experienced in the nineteenth century! And yet anyone with a keen eye sees that the Church is far from possessing now such a plenitude of power as it enjoyed in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when all the material and spiritual forces available were at its disposal. Since that epoch its power has, in point of intensity, suffered an enormous decline; arrested by a few brief outbursts of enthusiasm between 1540 and 1620, and in the nineteenth century."[1]

Roman Catholicism in England; Facts and Figures, and Conclusions therefrom.

There seems on the part of many a desire, almost feverish in its eagerness, to get hold of reliable statistics as to the progress and present position of Roman Catholicism in England. Owing to the lack of a religious census, such data are difficult to obtain.

[1] Harnack, "What is Christianity?" p. 265.

But the marriage returns of the Registrar-General afford valuable help in getting at the facts desired; for the discipline of the Romish Church is so strict that no actual adherents of that Church are likely to have the marriage ceremony performed for them by non-Roman ministers or by registrars. Now, on the basis of these returns, a writer in the *Quarterly Review* for 1888 made careful calculations; and to those whose spirits are wont to rise or fall according to statistics, the figures he gives will prove decidedly reassuring. In 1845, before the great Irish Immigration took place, the proportion of Roman Catholic marriages to the whole number was 1·95 per cent. In 1850, after the Immigration, it rose to 3·68; and in 1853, when the Papal Aggression was in force, it reached its highest point, viz., 5·09 per cent. But in 1885 the returns had sunk to 4·13 per cent.—a ratio lower than that of 1875, as it, in its turn, is lower than that of 1865. "This shows," says the writer in the *Quarterly*, "that there is no perceptible gain, and no advance has been made towards the goal of national conversion, and that Roman Catholics are now relatively to the whole nation just where they were in 1669. The only point open to debate is whether the Roman Catholic body is merely stationary, or actually receding in proportion to the entire population. On the broadest survey of the situation, the fact is simply that, fifty years ago, Roman Catholics constituted nearly one-third of the population of the United Kingdom, and now are reduced to one-seventh. Of course, this is almost entirely due to the great diminution of the population of Ireland, which has continued to go back since

1846; but it is none the less decisive of the general issue."

It must be borne in mind that the above findings were arrived at, and the conclusions based thereon published, more than ten years ago; but were the precise facts as to Rome's present position in this country ascertainable, it would probably be found that there has been very slight numerical advance made during the past decade. There has, indeed, been quite a remarkable increase of plant—if one may use the term—of all kinds, personal and material. The increase in the number of priests, monastic bodies, churches and chapels, schools and scholars, has been truly astonishing, as the comparative figures show. So much is this the case as to force the conclusions upon us that Rome has vast wealth at her command, and that she is quite willing to draw upon it freely in seeking to bring England back like a wandering sheep to the Roman fold.

The Changed Feeling to Roman Catholicism.

Statistics can elucidate and be made to prove many things, but they cannot gauge and register the change of feeling which has come over the minds of a large section of the English people with regard to Rome and all her works. To our minds, this change of feeling is more significant and ominous than would be the fact, established by the indubitable evidence of figures, that year by year the Papacy was making a slight numerical advance in this country. Some whose memories can go back forty or fifty years will

be able to testify to the change of feeling we speak of. Others whose experience of life has been of shorter duration may easily satisfy themselves that such a marked change of feeling has taken place, if they but note how bitter or contemptuous were the references to Roman Catholicism made by writers of repute in the earlier part of the century;[1] in this respect contrasting strikingly with the tone of the newspaper press and the literature of to-day when Romanism and her affairs come under observation. History will tell us what an indignant outcry was raised throughout the country by the Papal Aggression of 1850. When, on October 7, Dr. Whitty, Vicar-General of the Diocese of London, published the famous pastoral, "Given Out of the Flaminian Gate of Rome," which re-established the Roman hierarchy in England, the whole country was thrown into a state of panic. Lord John Russell wrote his famous "Durham Letter," in which he denounced not only the usurpation of Rome, but in even stronger language inveighed against "the unworthy sons of the Church of England," who were striving to introduce the "mummeries of superstition" in order "to confine the intellect and enslave the soul." The Pope, the Cardinal, and twelve Roman Catholic bishops, were burnt in effigy at Salisbury, to the music of the Morning Hymn and the National Anthem. When Dr. Wiseman, the newly-created Archbishop of Westminster, returned to London on November 12, hostility showed itself by stone-throwing.

[1] See, for instance, the passage in Foster's "Evils of Popular Ignorance."

These facts are cited, not because the doings of that time of agitation are approved, but simply to show that a notable change has taken place during the interval of fifty years between Cardinal Wiseman's investiture and Cardinal Vaughan's homage-paying to King Edward VII. How account for this change? It may be said that in the days of its proscription, and for some time after, the Romish Church in this country bore all the appearance of an alien institution entrenched on foreign soil; but that it has now lost the brand of being "un-English," which is the brand, of all others, Englishmen most dislike; and that it has lost it mainly because of the stream of converts it has received from the English Church, especially in 1845, when Newman went over; and again in 1850, after the Gorham case, when Manning became a 'vert; and that these accessions, consisting largely of loyal, University-trained Englishmen, have infused into it new blood, and given it an English tone and complexion by which the mass of Englishmen have been conciliated.

It may freely be admitted that due consideration should be given to such facts as these, and that largely as the result, direct and indirect, of the Oxford Movement, by which the sacerdotalism of the National Church has practically become a feeder of the Church of Rome, the latter has, to a certain degree, been nationalised. But when all allowance has been made for the facts named, the difficulty of accounting for the changed sentiment is by no means lessened, but rather enlarged; for if Anglicanism has so far approximated towards Rome as practically to become a feeder of the Romish Church in this

country, then the situation is even graver still. It is not Rome as un-English that is to be feared, but rather Rome as un-Kingdom-of-God-like; and if Anglicanism shares her sacerdotal exclusiveness, then Anglicanism ought to be regarded with similar distrust, and English people have a double battle to wage.

If the easy-going tolerance of Roman Catholicism, so characteristic of our times, were but found combined with a due knowledge of her history, and especially with a right apprehension of her spirit and aims, the tolerance would be more defensible. Then it might be regarded as the fulfilment of the precept: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." But tolerance of this simple, trustful, child-like kind is *not* conjoined with adequate knowledge; the knowledge would banish it, never to return, and men would set their faces as a flint against Rome and all things Roman, as the faces of Cromwell's old Ironsides were set, and looked grim and hard as Charles the Second made his entry into London.

Men know a great deal more of the *outside* of Romanism than their fathers did, but we believe they know less of it in its true *inwardness*. They are not likely to fall into such slight mistakes as to confuse between "monastery" and "convent," as even writers of books did fifty years ago. Rome, with an eye to her own propaganda, takes care that the public shall have the right kind of information meted out to them in sufficient quantity. She will see to it that men do not fall into error now in their use of Rome's technical terms, and that they shall be able to follow understandingly the descriptive reports of the

"imposing ceremonies" they will meet with in their newspapers; and, in short, she will see to it that they shall get the feeling that "the old Lady from Rome is not such a bad sort after all; and is decidedly making headway in the country."

But Rome, bland and conciliatory, is not the real Rome; neither is the Rome that Marie Corelli has sketched the real Rome. What she has given us is but the veriest caricature. If Rome were as pagan in unbelief, and as vile and corrupt, as she is described in the "Master Christian," she would not need to be feared, except as the corpse that has been too long unburied is to be feared and shunned. The Romanists to be feared are those who lead cleanly, even austere, lives—who believe in their system, and who would, if needs be, die for it. These are the men who, without a qualm of conscience or the tremor of a muscle, could ring the bells for another Bartholomew Massacre, or put you on the rack for your own soul's good and the greater glory of God. It is Rome, with her eternal persistence, patience, far-sighted purpose, that we have to reckon with. St. James speaks of the "long patience" of the husbandman; and in the length of her patience, and in her undaunted perseverance that will not be foiled, Rome could have given points to the spider Bruce saw mending its broken web.

The Conversion of England

It is well known that the eyes of the Curia are directed to England, as the land whose conversion is to be most earnestly desired and sought after. As

long ago as 1859 the late Cardinal Manning (then Archbishop) preached to a Roman Catholic Synod, of which Cardinal Wiseman was president. In his sermon he made the following remarks on the conversion of England, which it will be well to remember:

"If ever there was a land in which work was to be done, and perhaps much to suffer, it is here. I shall not say too much if I say that we have to subjugate and subdue, conquer and to rule an imperial race. We have to do with a will which reigns throughout the world, as the will of old Rome reigned once. We have to bend or break that will which nations and kingdoms have found invincible and inflexible. . . . Were it [heresy] conquered in England, it would be conquered throughout the world. All its lines meet here; and therefore in England the Church of God must be gathered in all its strength."[1]

These words were uttered in 1859, and although the will of this imperial race is not easily subjugated, yet the task of subjugating it has been steadily pursued. Rome means to see the business through. Appropriately enough, the century ended by Leo XIII. giving written expression to what is understood to be his most cherished dream. On September 13, 1900, he wrote a letter to his dear son, G. Bellecocq, of the Society of St. Sulpice, Paris, conveying his greeting and apostolic benediction. He recalls the fact that by letters apostolic of August, 1879, he had created, under the patronage of our Lady of Compassion, an arch-fraternity of prayers and good works for the return of Great Britain to the

[1] *The Tablet* of August 6, 1859.

Catholic faith. He goes on to say that "the results obtained abundantly prove how justified we were in placing our confidence in your institution. We have, indeed, learned, with the greatest joy, by the letter you have recently addressed to us, that a large number of the faithful in all parts of the world have become members, and are also becoming members of the associations of our Lady of Compassion. In order that this Catholic ardour, so accordant with our desires, may continually increase, we have thought well to establish a periodical review, whose purpose will be to make known the excellence of the confraternity, and to keep its associates informed as to its progress. There is here a work full of opportunities, and that will be very useful."

Evidence pointing in the same direction as the above could easily be multiplied, and is readily obtainable. That Rome desires the conversion of England, and, with this end in view, is prepared to lavish her resources and to summon all her energies, is just as notorious as that England is at war in South Africa, and means to win. And yet it is noticeable that warnings seem to fall on unwilling ears. For the good-natured, easy-going tolerance of Roman Catholicism of which we have spoken is apt to be associated with impatience of those who raise the cry of danger. Those who hoist the red flag are dubbed alarmists, and classed with the late Mr. Whalley and Mr. Newdegate as "fanatical," and as having got "Jesuitry on the brain." Let Dr. R. F. Horton but publish his "England's Danger," and he is not only assailed with virulent abuse by the Roman Catholic press, but has to endure the pooh-poohs ! of lukewarm Protestants.

Toleration or Non-toleration.

But, it may be asked, "What would you have or do? Is it desired to bring back the days before 1829, when Roman Catholics lived under heavy disabilities? Would you reintroduce the regime of intolerance?" Certainly not; the clock of progress must not, and cannot, be put back in that way. And yet, some men, good and true, were bitterly opposed to Catholic Emancipation, and resisted it by all the means in their power. They had the conviction that the passing of the bill would mean that "the British Legislature would be deprived of its purely Protestant character, and the adherents of the most hideous tyranny that ever existed would be admitted as the makers of laws for free men." Amongst the Methodists there was a strong feeling against the measure, shared by such men as Dr. Adam Clarke and Thomas Jackson (then Connexional editor), and only the prompt and resolute action of Jabez Bunting, president at the time, prevented the presentation of numerously-signed petitions from Methodists against the Bill.[1] As for Coleridge, the best and worst word he could find for the Act was to call it "a Surinam toad." But Thomas Arnold wrote a pamphlet in favour of Catholic Relief, and Macaulay defeated the Cambridge petition against it by beating up young M.A.'s in London, and going down with them in a car to vote. It is not difficult for us now to decide who chose the better way.

[1] "Recollections of My Own Life and Times," by Thomas Jackson, p. 408.

And yet it must be acknowledged a great strain is put upon our tolerance when we are called upon to extend the benefits of full toleration to those who, had they but the power as they may have the inclination, would not tolerate us. We can quite understand how Rousseau should be an advocate of reciprocity in toleration.[1] But under all temptations to the contrary, we must continue to be free-traders, and not fair-traders.

[1] "Il est impossible de vivre en paix avec des gens qu'on croit damnés ; les aimer serait haïr Dieu qui les punit ; il faut absolument qu'on les ramène ou qu'on les tourmente. . . . On doit tolérer tous les religions qui tolèrent les autres, autant que leurs dogmes n'ont rien de contraire aux devoirs du citoyen ; mais quiconque ose dire hors de l'Eglise point de salut, doit être chassé de l'Etat, a moins que l'Etat ne soit l'Eglise, et que le prince ne soit le Pontife."—"Contrat Social," liv. iv., cap. 8.

CHAPTER XI

ROMAN CATHOLICISM IN FRANCE

THE ecclesiastical history of France during the nineteenth century is profoundly instructive, and in its incessant yet progressive movement and occasional surprises, that history furnishes all the interest of a drama. The latest development of what is, in France, the unceasing struggle between Liberty and Absolutism in religion, between the forces of order and of anarchy, as seen in the Dreyfus case and the Associations Bill, deserves to be sympathetically followed and studied by those on this side of the Channel. It is but briefly we can here refer to what it would require a bulky volume adequately to set forth. But, as we cast our eye over the century, and mark the outworking of tendencies and the course of events, we shall see that certain things clearly emerge and stand out with distinctness. These are—(1) Napoleon's Concordat with the Pope; (2) The failure and break-up of the Liberal Catholic party; (3) The extinction of Gallicanism, and the triumph of Ultramontanism or the Jesuit faction; (4) The reaction against Clericalism.

Napoleon's Concordat with Rome.

The century opens dramatically by showing us a somewhat curious and unexpected sight. We see Napoleon, now First Consul, turned, for the nonce, theological student. He has caused to be got together for his special behoof a number of carefully selected treatises. He has even had the works of Bossuet translated, that he may master the views of that high-priest of Gallicanism, which, in brief, were "that the king and the bishops should rule the French Church; that the Pope has nothing to say about temporal things, and that in spiritual things also he is bound by the decisions of the Councils, his decisions, consequently, being unalterable only by the concurrence of the Church."[1] Thus we see the "little corporal" deep in his books; and looking into his mind, we perceive the purpose he has in view in turning himself into a book-worm. Of this purpose, indeed, he makes no secret; it is the frequent topic of his monologues. He is going to restore the fallen and desecrated altars of the Faith. He aspires to become—what, in fact, he was afterwards lauded as being—"the Cyrus, the Constantine, the Charlemagne of the present times."

But before we praise Napoleon's purpose and his industry, we must listen to the cynical avowals he makes to confidential listeners: The French people must have a religion to keep them quiet and satisfy them, and that religion they shall have. The Roman Catholic religion is alone to be thought of, and there-

[1] Harnack, "Outlines of the History of Dogma."

fore that religion shall have his protection and support. Protestantism shall be tolerated; but as for Roman Catholicism, it shall be declared to be the religion of the majority of the French people. In carrying out his purpose, there are one or two little matters for settling which it will be necessary for him to call in the assistance of the Pope—as, for instance, the reducing of the number of the French dioceses, and getting rid of a few superfluous bishops—but that assistance the Pope can be persuaded or coerced into giving. Such was Napoleon's purpose, and it is clear as noonday that to Napoleon religion was merely an affair of expediency or of policy.

After much trouble, the Concordat with the Pope was made, and although Napoleon apparently gained his object, he saw afterwards, what is clear enough to-day, that he had outwitted himself. "It was the author of the Concordat," said Lamennais, in 1819, "who made the Pope the supreme head of the Pastoral order, and the source of the Jurisdiction of the Church." "On the 18th of April, 1802, being Easter Sunday, the Concordat was published; and a solemn *Te Deum* was chanted in great pomp at Notre Dame to celebrate the general peace and the re-establishment of worship. An immense crowd filled the streets. The acclamations which saluted the great Consul, as he was called, were sufficiently explained by his glory and genius, as well as by the services which he had rendered, without discovering in them a proof of adhesion to the Concordat." On the return from Notre Dame, after the ostentatious dinner which celebrated the peace of consciences, the First Consul, who was well satisfied with the success

of so thorny a business, said to some of his generals: "Is it not true that to-day everything appeared re-established in the ancient order?" "Yes," answered one of them, "except two millions of French, who have died for liberty, and whom we cannot bring to life again."[1]

Let our readers take notice of this State function celebrated in Notre Dame. Ere long we shall witness a second service of the kind, which was even a greater profanation than the first. When potentates and warriors presume to intermeddle with the doctrines, constitution, or discipline of the Church, whether it be Constantine haranguing heretics at the Council of Nicæa, or Napoleon excogitating a Concordat with Rome, the sight is not edifying, and the results are anything but profitable to the Church. Despite the *Te Deum* at Notre Dame, Napoleon lived to regret that he had not "stuck to his last," and refrained from playing the rôle of ecclesiastical statesman. Many of France's most grievous troubles can be traced back to Napoleon's Concordat of 1802. Had Napoleon but listened to the advice of Lafayette, who made a journey for the express purpose of dissuading the First Consul from setting up an official religion, and who besought him to proclaim liberty of worship, such as was enjoyed in the United States, how different the subsequent course of French history might have been!

[1] E. D. Pressensé, D.D., "The Church and the French Revolution," pp. 475-6.

The Failure and Break-Up of the Liberal Catholic Party.

Reference has more than once been made to Lamennais, the Breton, of deep and enthusiastic nature—a man of genius and piety, and withal one who was in intense sympathy with liberty, although he was an Ultramontane, too. A strange combination! In 1830, Lamennais, in conjunction with his young friends, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and the Abbé Gerbet, founded a journal called *L'Avenir.* The aim of Lamennais and his friends, who were the children of Romanticism, and also devoted children of the Church, was to reconcile Catholicism with unbounded freedom. Their views they sought to advance through the medium of *L'Avenir;* but as they contended for liberty of speech, of printing, and of teaching, they soon came into collision with those to whom the advocacy of such liberal views was distasteful, and by whom the views themselves were regarded as revolutionary, and opposed to the interests of the Church.

Lamennais resolved to appeal to the Pope, and so he, accompanied by Lacordaire and Montalembert, made his way to Rome, and sought an interview with Gregory XVI., which, after some delay, was granted. This interview is the scene that strikes one's imagination, and lingers there. We have been conducted of late by hardy novelists into the very penetralia of the Vatican, and have "assisted" at interviews with the

Pope. But these are fancy pictures; and this is a real one. In the one, puppets, pulled by strings, move and emit sounds; here, at any rate, are living men, but men how different!

It was on March 13, 1832, the three champions of liberty were admitted to the presence of the Holy Father:

Lamennais fell upon his knees. . . . Gregory XVI. raised him up immediately, with a smile of kindness. He held in his hand a large snuff-box . . . and after slowly opening it, he said quietly, "Do you take snuff?"

The Abbé took a pinch for politeness' sake, inwardly cursing, and saying that he had not come to take snuff.

The Pope then took one himself, gravely sniffed it in, not without soiling the front of his cassock.

"Are you fond of art?" he said abruptly.

"At times."

"That is not enough."

"I like it in its place," said Lamennais, slightly angered . . . "but just now . . ."

"You know it is what is best in Rome," said the Pope quickly.

"After something else," replied Lamennais, "and, if your Holiness will permit me . . ."

The Pope interrupted him.

"Have you been to see the Church of St. Peter's Chains, Monsieur l'Abbé?"

"I have, Holy Father; and would to God it was the only church in chains in the Christian world!"

The Pope pretended not to notice the allusion.

"I suppose you saw Michael Angelo's Moses?"

"It is his masterpiece; but, for my part, with all the devotion . . ."

"I think you are wrong," said the Pope, with warmth. "I can show you another masterpiece of Michael Angelo, which can well bear comparison with it." And he took from his writing-table a silver statuette.

"Do you not recognise the claw of the lion?" he added, handing it to Lamennais.

Lamennais looked at it with a far-off air, as a man preoccupied with another thought.

"Examine it carefully," said the Pope.

Lamennais looked at it again.

"I should like to be able to make you a present of it," continued the Pope, "but nothing here belongs to me; I have received, and I must hand it on to my successor." He laid his hand on Lamennais' head. "Farewell, Monsieur l'Abbé." And he gave him his benediction.[1]

Disheartened with the hollow, fruitless interview, Lamennais lingered a while in Rome, hoping for another conference—but his hopes were vain. At Munich, on August 30, a severe condemnation reached them. From that blow Lamennais never recovered. It practically shattered his faith and broke his heart. This man of genius—this true son of the Church, for whom, it was whispered, a Cardinal's hat had been designed, and who had even, it was thought, been reserved for the Papal throne, was lost to the Church.

Lacordaire and Montalembert struggled on; the former brought the white habit of the Dominican

[1] Given in "The Abbé de Lamennais and the Liberal Catholic Movement in France." By the Hon. W. Gibson, 1896, pp. 212-13.

Order into Notre Dame, and moved vast audiences with his eloquence; the latter fought for liberty and the Church with a like eloquence from the tribune of the Chamber of Peers. After the downfall of the monarchy of July, and the establishment of the Republic (1848), Liberal Catholicism seemed to be in the ascendant. But a fatal step was taken when, as the result of a coalition of parties, was passed the "too famous law of 1851, giving liberty of teaching, which introduced the episcopate into the Superior Council of Public Instruction, handed over in great part primary education to the religious bodies, and practically removed the barriers to the re-establishment of the religious orders, foremost among whom came the Jesuits."[1]

The Triumph of Ultramontanism.

It was really the terrible *coup d'état* that shattered the Liberal Catholic party, and led to the triumph of the Ultramontanes. The latter prostrated themselves before "the man of December"—the man who must be held responsible for one of the most execrable deeds recorded in history—not even exceeded in horror and criminality by the Massacre of St. Bartholomew; for it cannot plead before the bar of history the poor excuse that it was wrought through religious fanaticism, but was simply an act of rapine and murder perpetrated on a whole people. Lacordaire was banished from Paris because he had uttered his protest against the *coup d'état* from the pulpit of

[1] E. D. Pressensé, "Contemporary Portraits."

St. Roch. But "the bishop and the *Univers*, notwithstanding the protest of certain stubborn members, were won over by the fine-sounding advances of the Prince-President, and threw themselves at the feet of the new power, glorifying the bloody restoration of authority. From that time the word of destiny was spoken."[1]

We have referred to one historic celebration in Notre Dame. Kinglake, in his inimitable prose, shall describe to us another; and looking on in imagination, the thoughtful reader will find in this brilliant mid-century function much that explains what went before and followed after.

"In Europe at that time there were many men, and several millions of women who, truly believed that the landmarks which divided good from evil were in charge of priests, and that what Religion blessed must needs be right. Now, on the thirtieth day, computed from the night of the 2nd day of December, the rays of twelve thousand lamps pierced the thick wintry fog that clogged the morning air, and shed their difficult light through the nave of the historic pile which stands marking the lapse of ages, and the strange chequered destiny of France. There waiting, there were the bishops, priests, and deacons of the Roman branch of the Church of Jesus Christ. These bishops, priests, and deacons stood thus expecting, because they claimed to be able to conduct the relations between man and his Creator; and the swearer of the oath of the 20th of December had deigned to

[1] E. Fontanes, "The Religious Situation in France. Modern Review," 1882.

apprise them that again, with their good leave, he was coming into the 'presence of God.' And he came. Where the kings of France had knelt, there was now the persistent manager of the company that had played at Strasburg and Boulogne, and with him, it may well be believed, there were Morny rejoicing in his gains, and Magnan soaring high above sums of four thousand pounds, and Maupas no longer in danger; and St. Arnaud, formerly Le Roy, and Fialin, more often called 'Persigny,' and Fleury, the propeller of all, more eager, perhaps, to go and be swift to spend his winnings than to sit in a cathedral, and think how the fire of his temperament had given him a strange power over the fate of a nation.

"When the Church perceived that the swearer of the oath and all his associates were ready, she began her service. Having robes whereon all down the back there was embroidered the figure of a cross, and being, it would seem, without fear, the bishops and priests went up to the high altar and scattered rich incense, and knelt and rose, and knelt and rose again. Then, in the hearing of thousands, there pealed through the aisles that hymn of praise which purports to waft into heaven the thanksgivings of a whole people for some new and signal mercy vouchsafed to them by Almighty God. It was because of what had been done to France within the last thirty days that the Hosannas arose in Notre Dame. Moreover, the priests lifted their voices and cried aloud, chanting and saying to the Most High: 'Domine, salvum fac Ludovicum Napoleonem' (O Lord! save Louis Napoleon).

"What is good, and what is evil? And who is he

that deserves the prayers of a nation? If any man, being scrupulous and devout, was moved by the events of December to ask these questions of his Church, he was answered that day in the Cathedral of our Lady of Paris."[1]

[1] Kinglake's "The Invasion of the Crimea," vol. i., pp. 334-5.

CHAPTER XII

THE DIRECTION AND LOGICAL END OF THE DOUBLE MOVEMENT

WHITHER do these movements ultimately tend? What are their *terminii ad quem?* To help us to answer this question, we might refer to the opinion of the Rev. Arthur W. Hutton, who points out that the nineteenth century "has been marked by two distinct currents—the one being a recurrence to the principle of authority, and the other an appeal to the facts of spiritual experience." The former, he says, "tends ultimately to Rome, as the most consistent exponent of the principle in question; the latter falls in with the genius of the Reformed Churches, and forms, indeed, the ground of their present vitality."[1] We believe this judgment to be eminently sound, both as relates to what Mr. Hutton calls the "two distinct currents" of the theological thought of the nineteenth century, and the direction in which those currents are setting. What we call the Church-idea "tends ultimately to Rome"; the Man of the Vatican is the final expression and logical conclusion of that idea.

In his strange book, "Doctrine and Doctrinal Disruption," Mr. W. H. Mallock, for polemic purposes,

[1] "The Mind of the Century." By various writers, p. 80.

develops a biological theory of the Romish Church, of which he is such a brilliant defender. The Church of Rome, he holds, "is an organisation, but is something more—it is also an *organism*." It is a vast body with a single undying personality—an unbroken personal consciousness. Being endowed with a single brain, "the Church is endowed also with a continuous historic memory; is constantly able to explain and to restate doctrine, and to attest, as though from personal experience, the facts of its earliest history. Is doubt thrown on the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ? The Church of Rome replies, "I was at the door of the Sepulchre myself. My eyes saw the Lord come forth. My eyes saw the cloud receive Him." Is doubt thrown on Christ's miraculous birth? The Church of Rome replies, "I can attest the fact, even if no other witness can; for the angel said 'Hail!' in my ear as well as Mary's." We make no comments on the audacious assumptions of this passage, but simply go on to observe that though Mr. Mallock speaks of the Church of Rome as endowed with a brain and continuous memory, and as speaking with authority, we miss any distinct reference to the precise function now discharged by the Pope. We say "*now* discharged"; for if this theory of the Church of Rome as an organism is to be retained, then it must be admitted the organism underwent its last and crowning biological transformation in the nineteenth century. When in July, 1870, the dogma of Papal infallibility was proclaimed "in thunder, lightning and rain, and by the extemporised light of candles," the final stage in something very much like an apotheosis or new incarnation was attained. The Pope was acclaimed

as the brain, heart, mind, and tongue of the Holy Roman Church. He then became the acknowledged organ of the Holy Ghost. He could say, as none of his predecessors could say—not even he who presided over the famous Council of Trent—"The Kingdom of God is the Church, and the Church it is I." Before the Vatican Council broke up on the 18th of July, 1870, its members might have sung their *Nunc Dimittis*, for they must have known when they shouted or groaned their "Placets" that that Council was likely to be the last of its line. By the formal promulgation in public session of the Pope's "full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, not only in matters relating to faith and morals, but also in those relating to discipline and the government of the Church in every region of the earth," the Council virtually pronounced the supersession of General Councils. "When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." In the future there may be great gatherings of ecclesiastics in the centre of Roman Christendom, attended with much of the old-time pomp; but if so, it will not be because such gatherings will be essential to the Church's development, but only that they may serve to grace, with due spectacular and ceremonial observances, the authoritative pronouncements of the sovereign pontiff.

We know that to the average Protestant mind there is something almost absurd about this theory of Papal infallibility; it seems so remote from the preoccupations of ordinary life; so repugnant to the usual considerations which have weight with the man of average intelligence. To such a man the history of the proceedings which culminated in the

declaration of the dogma in question will have little attraction. He will relegate it to the long chapter which deals with the history of human superstitions and follies. He has, however, quite different feelings with regard to certain other events which will, as long as history comes to be written, be associated with the Vatican Council. The Franco-German war, the defeat of France, the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome, the entry of the Italian troops into the city, and the downfall of the Pope's temporal power—all these interlinked events interest him much more deeply, for they not only followed each other with dramatic rapidity, but have had momentous and far-reaching consequences. Even the politician will admit that the loss of the Pope's temporal power was a notable event. Some students of prophecy are evidently of the same opinion; for they see in it the fulfilment of the prediction of the Apocalypse. Holding, as some of them do, that the beast of Rev. xiii. and xvii. represents the political power of the Papacy, they claim to find that this political ascendancy was to continue 42 months, or, on the year-day theory, for a period of 1260 years. They date this period from the death of Phocas (610), from whom the Bishop of Rome obtained a decree giving him the headship of all the Churches of Christendom, and it had its termination in this fateful year 1870.[1] The interpretation is not mentioned to be endorsed, but only to show that the end of the Pope's temporal power is thought by some to be of quite sufficient importance to have been set

[1] E. H. Horne, M.A., "Divine Clues to Sacred Prophecy," 1901, pp. 74, 75.

forth in prophecy. It may well be granted that amongst the external events of the nineteenth century the Franco-German war, and what resulted from it, must ever hold a foremost place. The sudden collapse and humbling of France, the loss of her fair Rhenish provinces, and the swift downfall of the showy Second Empire, the unification of Italy, the establishment of the German Empire under the hegemony of Prussia, and the loss of the Pope's temporal power, make up a series of events difficult to parallel, either for their dramatic interest or for the influence they have exerted, and will continue to exert, on the history of Europe. No doubt the temporal power of the Papacy was an active factor in these successive events. We do not know, and probably may never know, what amount of truth there was in the gossip of the time as to the part played by the Empress Eugenie in the complicated interplay of courts and cabinets. She was devoted to the Papacy, and gossip said that to her ascendancy was owing the precipitance of the war, as a probable escape from revolutionary troubles at home, and as likely to be of advantage to the Holy Father and Holy Church. But for the Empress, it was again whispered, the alliance of Victor Emmanuel with France would have been gained, though at the price of the surrender of home to Italy.[1] The policy was urged upon Napoleon by Prince Jerome. But the clerical influences at home, foremost amongst which was the strong will of Eugenie, were too much for

[1] She is credited with the exclamation, "Better the Prussians at Paris than the Italians at Rome!" and she repeatedly spoke of "ma guerre."

the Emperor to resist. His refusal to pay the price sealed the fate of the Second Empire. On the 6th of August, 1870, the battle of Woerth was fought, and on the evening of that day a despatch with the news was handed to Victor Emmanuel in his box at the theatre. He read it with emotion, and exclaimed: "The poor Emperor! I pity him; but I have had a narrow escape." [1]

The declaration of Papal infallibility was a climax; the downfall of the temporal power was a dissolution. In the former a movement reached its culminating point, an idea reached its embodiment, one might even say its incarnation; in the latter, an idea which had got itself organised, and in the palmy days of Papal ascendancy been all-powerful amongst the nations of Europe, now reached its period. With the loss of the temporal power the idea became, as it were, disembodied. But the idea still haunts the mind of the Pope and his *entourage* at the Vatican. As an idea to be rehabilitated and re-embodied it is still influential and troublesome; witness the uneasiness caused last year by the Duke of Norfolk's address to the "prisoner of the Vatican," on the occasion of the visit of the English pilgrims to the Eternal City. To those who seek to trace the growth of the Church-idea, this culmination of the idea in the sacrosanct person of the Pope is of surpassing interest. By the outworking of the logic immanent in that idea, we see it reaching its climax in an individual.

Here is a little anecdote of some interest in this

[1] W. J. Stillman, "The Union of Italy" (1815-1895), pp. 348, 349.

connection. When the famous Council that decreed infallibility was in progress, we are told that Pius IX. took a warm interest in its proceedings, even going the length of pressing his claims upon those who happened to come near him. One writer tells how the Holy Father, in showing his guests over the Palace, called their attention to a picture in the Vatican Library representing Christ in a boat asleep, but "Pius IX. taking the helm in the midst of the howling storm and surging waves."[1] This picture, and the Pope's attitude to it, are significant of much, and should not be lost sight of. Well might "Janus" say in another connection, and without thought of this particular picture: "It was St. Jerome's reproach to the Pelagians that, according to their theory, God had, as it were, wound up a watch once for all, and then gone to sleep because there was nothing more for Him to do. Here we have the Jesuit supplement to this view. God has gone to sleep because in His place His ever-wakeful and infallible Vicar on earth rules as Lord of the world, and dispenser of grace and punishment. St. Paul's saying, 'In Him we live, and move, and are,' is transferred to the Pope. . . . We owe it to Bellarmine and other Jesuits that in some documents the Pope is expressly designated 'Vice-God.' The *Civiltà Cattolica*, too, after asserting that all the treasures of divine revelation, of truth, righteousness, and the gifts of God, are in the Pope's hand, who is their sole dispenser and guardian, comes to the conclusion that

1 "The Council of the Vatican." By Canon Pope, Dublin, 1891, p. 195. Quoted in "Catholicism and the Vatican." By J. L. Whittle, 1872, p. 28.

the Pope carries on Christ's work on earth, and is in relation to us what Christ would be if He was still visibly present to rule His Church. It is but one step from this to declare the Pope an incarnation of God." [1]

Pope Pius IX. has gone; but the Papacy remains, and Leo. XIII., "with eyes of black diamond set in an alabaster face," has grasped the tiller of the boat of "the one Holy and Catholic Church," and guides its destinies. This is how an enthusiastic "Roman Catholic Reviewer" wrote of the present occupant of that boat, depicted by the artist in the picture to which Pius drew the admiring attention of his guests in the Vatican Library. Let it be noted, too, as showing that fervent Roman Catholics, who believe in the Pope as the "ultimate" man, and who know how to use the pen, can have their say, not merely in the *Tablet* or other Roman Catholic prints, but even in the Literary Page of the *London Daily Chronicle* of July 10, 1899. Rome knows the power of the press, and does not disdain to use it for her own purposes. But let us hear about the "ultimate" man, as the Roman Catholic Reviewer, nearer the truth than he knew, has designated Leo XIII.:—"The Papal throne stands upon a height of awful isolation; there are more kings and emperors than one, more leaders and princes in science and art than one; there is but one Pope, unique in his office, alone in his responsibilities, an 'ultimate' man. . . . He toils in his historic solitude, a Cæsar over souls, directing his legionaries and legates how best to strengthen and encourage his loyal subjects; how best to conquer or reclaim the

[1] "The Pope and the Council," 1869, p. 39.

ignorant or the rebellious. His wasted, well-nigh transparent form is for millions of all races and all tongues the central figure in the world; and his apostolic arms, stretched wide in blessing, embrace the whole brotherhood of man. A wonderful, an admirable, a pathetic figure! great with a greatness almost superhuman, laden with a burden of cares profoundly touching."

All this reads like blasphemy in very good English; and yet we thank a Roman Catholic Reviewer for having given us those two expressions—an "ultimate" man and "a Cæsar of souls"; for the former expression bears out our contention that the outworking of the Church-idea will naturally find its end in some such "ultimate" man as the Vatican Council declared Pius IX. to be, and as a Roman Catholic Reviewer, and thousands more, see in his successor. As for the other expression—"a Cæsar of souls"—it may serve to remind us that the Pope is the successor of the Cæsars in a much more real sense than he is the successor of St. Peter. The most competent scholars, such as Principal Fairbairn and Harnack, are agreed in this. The latter does not hesitate to say: "*The Roman Church privily pushed itself into the place of the Roman World-empire, of which it is the actual continuation.* The empire has not perished, but has only undergone a transformation. If we assert, and mean the assertion to hold good, even of the present time, that the Roman Church is the old Roman Empire consecrated by the Gospel, that is no mere 'clever remark,' but the recognition of the true state of the matter historically, and the most appropriate and fruitful way of describing the character of

this Church. It still governs the nations; its popes rule like Trajan and Marcus Aurelius; Peter and Paul have taken the place of Romulus and Remus; the bishops and archbishops of the proconsuls; the troops of priests and monks correspond to the legions; the Jesuits to the Imperial bodyguard." So a Roman Catholic Reviewer's fine description of Leo XIII. as "a Cæsar over souls, directing his legionaries and legates," is amply borne out by this quotation, and may be taken as no flight of fancy, but as the literal truth.

If the nineteenth century has shown us the logical outworking of the Church-idea, so has the century ended by making it plain that, for them who cannot but reject that idea, there is no middle course open, but that their final appeal must be made to the facts of Christian experience. This truth, in theory, may always have been acknowledged amongst us, though it has often, both in the case of individuals and communities, been obscured by form, or creed, or polity, being allowed to mediate between Christ and the soul. But now, from a variety of causes, some of which have had consideration in this lecture, it has come to be felt and acknowledged, as perhaps never before, that direct contact with Christ by His Spirit is our privilege, and that in this contact and communion is to be found our authority. And so, in coming back to Christ, we come back to the simplicity of faith, and experience the truth of the pregnant saying of Thomas à Kempis: "He to whom the Eternal Word speaketh is delivered from many an opinion." If Roman Catholicism has its "ultimate" man in the

person of the Pope, we have "der rechte Mann" of Luther's Psalm:

> "But for us fights the proper Man,
> Whom God Himself hath bidden.
> Ask ye, Who is this same?
> Christ Jesus is His name,
> The Lord Jehovah's Son,
> He, and no other one,
> Shall conquer in the battle."

Printed by Cowan & Co., Limited, Perth.